

for relief of Charles E. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Resolutions of Pomona Grange, Jefferson County, N. Y., for reduction of duties on Philippine products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of the Fruit Growers' Association of Adams County, Pa., for legislation to secure admission of American fruit to German markets at minimum duties—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Federation of Trades Unions of York, Pa., for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Rickrods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ella K. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Annie K. Slothower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Louis N. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of the Telegram, Holyoke, Mass., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE: Petition of Mary E. Rainey, heir of Thomas R. Couche, deceased, praying for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edwin W. Brayman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dora T. Bristol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William Marvin et al., for an appropriation to open, widen, and deepen the channel of Eightmile River, in Lyme, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary S. Houghtaling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of the Business Men's Association and the city council of Rock Island, Ill., for an appropriation to improve the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew J. Moore, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petitions of Annville Council, No. 954; Swatara (Middletown, Pa.) Council, No. 858, and Steelton Council, No. 162, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Silver Star Council (Harrisburg, Pa.), No. 130, and Lincoln Council (Carlisle, Pa.), No. 117, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of Milwaukee Division, No. 46, Railway Conductors of America, for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Aurela Robillard, and of H. P. Morancy, administrator of estate of Zachary White—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Philip Houser and heirs of Daniel Ruggles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Schadler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Cattle Raisers' Association, praying Congress to require the railways to furnish sufficient cars to ship live stock to market—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac L. Stine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of John S. Bray, Joseph W. King, James D. Cox, and Richard H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Maria Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Kelso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of J. H. Parkhurst et al., for an appropriation to reimburse said petitioners for over daily hours of work on Georgetown pumping station from May 1, 1871, to December, 1890—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Lansdale Council, No. 111,

Daughters of Liberty, of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEBB: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Mary C. Jones, Mary Ann Cody, Margaret L. James, Susan Baker, Mary Levina Williams, and Isabel Manney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of the Somerset (N. J.) Democrat, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 14, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SPERRY, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of William C. Manning (H. R. 1857, Fifty-eighth Congress), no adverse report having been made thereon.

PENSION DAY.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HERBURN in the chair.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 2. The pay of telephone switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, watchmen, laborers, and charwomen provided for in this act, except those employed in mints and assay offices, unless otherwise specially stated, shall be as follows: For telephone switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, and watchmen, at the rate of \$720 per annum each; for laborers, at the rate of \$660 per annum each; assistant telephone switchboard operators, at the rate of \$600 each, and for charwomen, at the rate of \$240 per annum each.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to section 2 in order to make an inquiry. Does this section increase or decrease the compensation of these employees, or simply classify them?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does not in any way increase or decrease the compensation, but it is for the purpose of preventing the continual repetition throughout the bill.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, Bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, Bureau, or office shall be transferred on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order upon this section.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to that section.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order until an explanation can be made.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of the appropriation bill the fact appeared that there is in every Department of the Government and in some of the bureaus of some of the Departments miscellaneous libraries, libraries of fiction

and belles-lettres, libraries wholly and entirely foreign to the administration or technical work of these Departments. These several Departments receive appropriations annually for the purchase of books without reference to the kind of books they are authorized to purchase, the theory of Congress being that certain books were essential in connection with the work of these Departments and that only such books were being purchased. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that these appropriations have been expended in the purchase of novels and other books of a literary and miscellaneous character, until some of these libraries have become extensive circulating libraries.

The Keep Commission some time ago appointed a subcommittee to investigate the extent and character of the libraries in the different Departments, to ascertain the character of the books, and also whether or not the maintenance of these libraries to the extent they now exist and are being maintained were essential to the public service and the administration of the Departments.

The chairman of the subcommittee when before the Committee on Appropriations gave our committee the information upon which this recommendation is based, and informed us that this provision is in line with the recommendation of the subcommittee made to the Keep Commission on this subject, and that the Keep Commission would later embody this recommendation in its final report to the President. It appears from the testimony of this committee that in the Interior Department the fiction and belles-lettres library alone occupies room in that Department three times the size of the largest room occupied by the Committee on Appropriations here in the Capitol. No man would pretend to say that standard or current novels, or any work of fiction, is necessary in the work of the Department. That being so, why should we maintain them? Why should we not vacate this room and make it available for the legitimate work of the Department. Every Department of the Government is crowded because of the want of space. Congress is constantly asked to appropriate money for the rent of new buildings, or to appropriate money for the erection of new buildings to accommodate the Departments. So urgent has this demand for space become that the Committee on Appropriations last session presented to the House, and the House adopted, a resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain the number of square feet of space occupied by old files in different Departments, files that have become useless or are no longer of service in the work of the Department, with a view to ascertaining how much space can be obtained for the use of the Department by removing these files and thus increase the available space for legitimate purposes. The Treasury Department is now making that investigation.

This provision is for the double purpose of securing additional space and of putting a stop to the purchase of books that do not pertain to or are of no essential use in the Departments and the bureaus in the transaction of their legitimate business. Some of these libraries are circulating libraries solely for the use of the Department clerks. I am unable to see how any Member of Congress can justify the maintenance of a circulating library in the workshops of the several Departments of the Government in Washington or anywhere else.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. TAWNEY. Just one word more. In addition to that, we are maintaining a free circulating library of sufficient size to accommodate the people of this city, independent of these Departmental libraries.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No, Mr. Chairman, I am in full sympathy with the purpose of this section, if it is accurately explained by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], and I have no doubt that it has been. The criticism that I desire to make of the provision is that it is altogether too strict. It prohibits the purchase by any officer or officer under this or any other act, so that it applies to all Departments of the Government, of books, periodicals, etc., except such as are strictly essential. That means such as can not be dispensed with. There are a good many publications that may contain valuable information, valuable suggestions respecting methods of reform, of improvement, that I believe it would be proper for the departmental officers to purchase and have access to, but this provision shuts that out. It seems to me that if you would strike that clause out, "are strictly essential," and insert something like this, "such books as have relation to the technical work of a Department."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from Indiana that the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. BINGHAM] has sent to the Clerk's desk the amendment which the gentleman from Indiana proposes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is all right.

Mr. BINGHAM. We have included the words "administrative, and scientific," following "technical and professional work."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This would practically prevent the purchase of any books that bear on the professional work of the Departments.

Mr. TAWNEY. This was prepared, I may say, by the librarian in charge of the Supreme Court library, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Keep Commission that made the investigation I have referred to, and after further consideration he suggested the amendment which the gentleman in charge of the bill will now propose. I trust that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will not insist on his point of order, because I think this provision is absolutely in the interest of good administration as well as economy. There is another phase to this question, to which I will refer briefly. It is the opportunity the presence of these libraries afford for the failure to give that attention to their duties which the Government has a right to expect from the clerks. It may not be true, and I do not state it as a fact, but members of the committee have it upon reliable authority that the convenience of these libraries in the Departments and the facility with which the clerks can in the morning go to the library and get a book, take it to their desks, prompts them occasionally, if the book is more interesting than their work, to engage in reading the book rather than in the discharge of their duty. This information influenced the committee to some extent in thus trying to put a stop to this practice, which we are informed obtains to some extent in certain Departments. The adoption of this provision will also release a large amount of space in the Department buildings and relieve the Government from the expense of caring for these libraries, these extensive miscellaneous and fiction libraries, now being maintained therein.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] in regard to this abuse that has grown up in the bureaus and Departments of the Government, and, in addition to the facts that he so clearly stated, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that out of one appropriation one of the Departments of this Government expended \$10,000 for novels, and that appropriation was made for the construction of battle ships. How it ever passed the auditor, under what sort of a name or what sort of a purchase, I do not know.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is a fact.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that that appropriation to which he refers was called to the attention of the committee in Congress some six or eight years ago, and there was a prohibition inserted in the succeeding bill. There has been no use of the fund to which he refers—the increase of the Navy—from that time to this for that purpose.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I do sincerely hope that the point of order will not be insisted on as against this item. There is no question but that a great abuse has arisen in nearly every Department of this Government in connection with these so-called "libraries." They are filled with novels, works of current fiction, books which have no relation whatever to the particular work being done. In fact, the practice of establishing libraries has grown to such an extent that now a library is being conducted in connection with every one of the high schools in this city. To show the gentleman from Illinois to what extent this abuse has grown, I direct attention to the fact that in some, if not all, of the high school libraries last year there was expended many dollars for the purchase of magazines and periodicals—hundreds of dollars for current magazines and periodicals—for the alleged use of the pupils of these schools. I will further give him a sample of the character of books ordered by those in authority for these high schools.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman thinks, under that expressed provision of law, there would be any authority to purchase periodicals or magazines—

Mr. BURLESON. Unless they related to the work of the particular Departments, I do not think they would have authority to purchase them.

Mr. MANN. Technical periodicals are one thing, but Scribner's and Harper's are not technical magazines. Now, would there be any authority on the part of any Government official under this to purchase a magazine or newspaper which was not technical or scientific?

Mr. BURLESON. If there was an article in a particular magazine that related to the work being done by a particular department—technical work—they could purchase it; otherwise they could not and ought not to be permitted to purchase

it. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the character of books bought for these libraries, and the same abuse has been practiced in the departments that obtains in the high schools. What do you think of the authorities purchasing Little Boy Blue for a library that is conducted in connection with the high school and which it is claimed is needed as a reference library? The Fairies' Lullaby, Pudd'nhead Wilson, Four Feet, Two Feet, and No Feet, The Swallows' Flight; in fact, some ridiculous publications are purchased to be placed in these high school libraries. And there are more ridiculous purchases made in connection with libraries that are now being maintained in the various departments. Thousands of volumes of modern fiction bought with public money and carried in these libraries. The truth is many of these libraries have become mere circulating libraries, and there can be and ought not to be any attempted justification of their continuance.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order? The Chair is ready to rule upon this proposition if the point of order is made.

Mr. MANN. I understand, but having reserved the point of order I think I ought to say a word in defense of myself. I shall at the proper time insist upon the point of order. The provision in the bill is not well considered, although it has been considered by very able gentlemen. It is contradictory to the bill itself. The bill authorizes an appropriation, for instance, for the purchase of books and periodicals in the State Department, which can make no use of technical or professional works. It authorizes the purchase of books and periodicals in various Departments which make no use of so-called "technical" or "scientific" works. I do not know whether Webster's Dictionary would be considered a technical work for the special and professional work of a particular Department, and perhaps the gentleman thinks that since we have had a new order of orthography it is not necessary to have dictionaries. I do not agree with him.

Mr. TAWNEY. We have not now the new order of orthography.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would state to the gentleman from Illinois that this provision does not limit the Department necessarily to scientific works pertaining to the Department. The gentleman refers to the State Department. There is a great deal of literature published, historical and current literature, bearing upon questions pertaining to our foreign relations.

Mr. MANN. Which they ought to have.

Mr. TAWNEY. Which they ought to have and which under this provision—

Mr. MANN. And which they could not buy unless they violate the law.

Mr. TAWNEY. They could buy it.

Mr. MANN. Here is the reading of the language of the proposed amendment, "Only such books, etc., shall be purchased, etc., as are strictly essential"—

Mr. TAWNEY. Wait a moment—

Mr. MANN. I am reading the provisions of the bill, if the gentleman will pardon me, "strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department." Why, under that provision you could not buy a directory for the use of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, if the gentleman will permit me, and I think he wants to be fair on this proposition—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. TAWNEY. Before the gentleman reserved the point of order, the gentleman in charge of the bill sent to the Clerk's desk a committee amendment so that it would read "administrative, scientific, professional, and technical." Now, that would admit of the purchase of books essential to the administration of the Department and prevent the maintenance of large circulating libraries in these various Departments. That is the object of this provision. It is not proposed to curtail the Department in the purchase of anything which is essential to the administration of the Department itself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed now by the committee, which I have heard for the first time, and which the members of this committee have heard for the first time—

Mr. TAWNEY. It is the second time, because I stated it to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] a few moments ago when answering his inquiry.

Mr. MANN. But I have not heard it.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman's point of order cut me off.

Mr. MANN. Certainly, "the gentleman from Illinois" is wise

enough not to permit the gentleman to offer an amendment which would absolutely cut out the point of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. It was not for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. It would have that effect, whatever the purpose was. The amendment now proposed shows that when the committee offered the original proposition they had not duly considered it. They now propose to change, admitting that the original proposition is wrong. It may be that the committee has given due consideration to the subject now, but it is evident they had not given it due consideration before. As for myself I have not been able to give due consideration to the subject since, just now for the first time hearing the amendment read, and before this goes into a law I want the opportunity to duly consider it, and I therefore insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 9, on page 19, and to line 2, on page 12, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. We have no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Those are two about which I talked to the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] asks unanimous consent to return to line 9, on page 19, and to line 2, on page 12. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the amendment reported for information.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the amendment that I propose to offer if the request is granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19, line 9, strike out "two" and insert "four."

Mr. SHERMAN. I will explain to the gentleman, if I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, that this is the only one of the employees especially provided for that has not been increased to \$1,400, and it affects the doorkeeper at this door, Mr. Jennison, who has been here for sixteen years, and this amendment puts him on an equality with the others.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to introduce an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN]?

Mr. MANN. There is only one amendment, as I understand, that has been explained so far, and he will offer two or three.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the second amendment?

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will offer the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I would ask the Clerk to report the amendment which I have just handed up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 2, after the words "Journal clerk," strike out "and" and insert "four thousand dollars."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that the Journal clerk's salary shall be raised from \$3,600 to \$4,000, and is only in keeping with the services which, I believe, that official renders.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which the Clerk will now report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 9, page 19, strike out "two" and insert "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 2, after the words "journal clerk," strike out the word "and" and insert "four thousand dollars."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 23 for the purpose of moving to strike out the provision which was inserted day before yesterday in respect to spelling, or the orthography used in printing public documents. The action of the House yesterday, just before adjournment, in adopting the resolution presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LINDIS], and as the papers announced this morning it is the purpose of the President to to-day issue an order revoking his former order issued some time ago with respect to simplified spelling, leaving the matter

of the orthography in which public documents shall be printed under authority of law to remain just as it has been in the past, it is entirely unnecessary that this limitation should remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to return to page 23 for the purpose of giving him an opportunity to move to strike out line 20 and the following lines of the page. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now move to strike out the words indicated by the Chair—the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the paragraph stricken out insert:

"No money appropriated in this act shall be used in connection with printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof unless the same shall conform to the orthography recognized and used by generally accepted dictionaries of the English language."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment, on a motion to strike out the language just read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The question was taken; and the motion to strike out was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals in the bill where there are errors from the action of the committee in the last few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct any erroneous totals in the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BINGHAM. I now move, Mr. Chairman, that the bill with amendments be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21574) and had directed him to report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BINGHAM. I now move the previous question on the amendments to the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote asked on any of the amendments? If not, the vote will be taken in gross.

No separate vote was demanded.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to in gross.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent granted yesterday, I now offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On and after the 4th of March, 1907, the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and Vice-President shall be at the rate of \$12,000 per annum.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Before the gentleman starts into a discussion of the question, can we agree on a division of the time?

Mr. LITTAUER. I have no disposition to limit debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then the gentleman will agree that the opponents of the amendment shall be recognized before he moves the previous question?

Mr. LITTAUER. So far as I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have no comment whatever to make on the amendment I have offered. Everyone recognizes the dignity of the position of Speaker of this House, recognizes that the duties are arduous, and that the pay is altogether unequal to the position. No Speaker can live and pay his expenses out of the \$8,000 now appropriated. As far back as fifty years ago, in 1856, Congress appropriated twice the amount of salary to the Speaker as to Members of this House. It appears to me that this amendment, at least, ought to be adopted unanimously.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LITTAUER. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. Can the gentleman give the House information as to what compensation is allowed the speaker of the House of Commons?

Mr. LITTAUER. The Speaker of the House of Commons is allowed a salary of \$25,000 a year and a magnificent gothic residence. At the end of his term of service he is usually made a peer and given a further pension of \$20,000 a year. The

speaker of the French Chamber of Deputies, again, is given a palace to live in, \$15,000 a year, and a regiment of soldiers [laughter], and the drum corps plays every time he takes his seat. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to any further increase of salaries for legislative and executive officers. I do believe that the salaries of some of the minor clerks in the Government must necessarily be increased on account of the increased cost of living, but this does not apply to the higher governmental officer. I am opposed and have always been opposed to increasing the salaries of Members of the House or Senators.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to an inquiry?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did not the gentleman favor the proposition and speak in favor of the raising of the salaries of the Federal judges here not long ago?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know that I did.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know you did, for I heard you. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was in favor of paying the Federal judges additional salary, but that is a very different proposition from paying a legislative salary.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You also voted to pay for the offices they used. I pay for my own office and you pay for yours. We are Members of Congress. Are the judges any better than we are?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I think they are.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, I never saw a judge who I thought was any better than you or myself. [Laughter and applause.] We are all equals under the law and under the Stars and Stripes, and I want to keep it that way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, when I said that probably some of the judges were better than ourselves I was referring to myself and the average Member of Congress, but of course not to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why a judge should receive a greater salary than a Member of Congress, or a member of the legislative branch of the Government. The Federal judges are appointed for life. Eminent lawyers are able to earn very large incomes in their private law practice, and if you want the strongest and ablest men on the bench you have got to pay them commensurate salaries. But that is not true as to the man who occupies a legislative position.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not until I finish what I have to say.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no legislative body in the world that pays its members as much as the Members of the Congress of the United States are paid. It is looked on as an honor for a man to represent his government in its legislative branch, and it is not expected that he should represent the people for the monetary consideration. It is expected in all legislative bodies that he should represent them for the honor that he receives, not as a permanent avocation in life, but as a temporary proposition, and it is so in the American Congress. I do not believe that the average Member of Congress serves as much as two terms. He does not come here to make his living, as the judge goes to the Federal bench, to stay there for a lifetime and support himself from his salary and lay aside something for his family. It is true there are some few men in this body and in the Senate whose constituents have honored them by keeping them here for nearly a lifetime, but that is the exception to the rule. The average man comes here for only a short time. He does not come here to make money, and he should not come here to make money. He can not make money out of the salary that is paid, and he should not make money in his legislative capacity by using his office for that purpose. Now, I claim that the only reason for giving a salary at all to a member of a legislative body is that a poor man may come here and represent his constituents, whether he has independent means or not, and I do not think any man can deny the proposition that any man in the United States, no matter how poor he is, can come here with his family and live comfortably on the salary that is paid to a Member of Congress. I do not contend that he can live here and keep pace with the modern society of Washington. And if we should make the salary \$7,500, he could not live here with his whole family at the best hotel and keep carriages, horses, and automobiles, and keep pace with modern society in Washington, and that is not expected.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the gentleman state to us what his monthly expenses are during the time he is here in Washington?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I am willing to state that. I can not state accurately, but when I am in Washington it takes about all my salary to live. It does not take all of my salary to support me when I am at home. If the gentleman wants a candid answer, I have given it to him.

Mr. LITTAUER. I have no desire to limit any debate in connection with the amendments I shall offer. But I think it is a wrong precedent. If we start out by increasing salaries now—and I am discussing this question from this standpoint because I believe if this resolution goes to the Senate it will not be limited to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate and the Cabinet officers as it is when presented here today; but when it goes to the Senate it will be amended in the Senate and cover the salaries of the members of the Senate and of the House and will come back here in that shape, and if it comes back here in that shape it will come in a conference report, where it will be impossible for this House to meet the question singly and alone. Therefore I think we might as well consider it from this point now.

As to gentlemen who think they are not getting enough salary and think that the salary ought to be increased and are willing to take the responsibility to vote themselves more salary, I have no personal criticism to make. But I want to say to the House that, so far as I am concerned and my constituency is concerned, I do not believe that the constituency that I represent would uphold me in putting into my pocket now or for the future an increased salary, and therefore I intend to vote against this proposition when it comes before the House.

The gentleman from Alabama understands that this amendment only applies to the Speaker of the House and the Vice-President?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes, I understand; but when it comes back from the Senate it will come back with Members of the House and the Senate included.

Mr. LITTAUER. Well, it is only fair to say to the gentleman that I will offer other amendments later, one covering the salary of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I anticipated what I knew would ultimately come. But I wanted to present now this question to the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to vote for even a larger salary for the Vice-President and Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understood the gentleman from Alabama had closed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to ascertain about the time, and whether the gentleman from Alabama yielded the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor so that the gentleman can be recognized in his own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized in his own right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I said that I should be glad to vote a much larger salary to the Vice-President and to the Speaker of the House. The proposed \$12,000 salaries are not, in my judgment, sufficiently large for the offices. For the information of the House, I desire to call attention to the fact that five officials, other than judicial officers, in the city of New York, receive salaries larger than those proposed here, while a number of others receive compensation equal to the sum named in the pending amendment. The mayor of the city of New York receives a salary of \$15,000 a year; the comptroller, the city's chief financial officer, \$15,000, and the corporation counsel, the chief law officer of the city, \$15,000. The sheriff of New York County receives \$12,000 and one-half of the fees of his office, which aggregate a considerable sum, and the sheriff of the county of Kings receives \$15,000. Both counties are within the city. The district attorney of New York is paid \$12,000; three members of a water-supply commission, \$12,000 each, and the city chamberlain, \$12,500.

I can not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a single Member of this House who does not realize that the Vice-President of the United States and the Speaker of this House occupy positions of greater dignity, larger responsibility, and greater importance to the people than any of those mentioned. The compensation of these two officials should be such as to enable them to live in that style or manner befitting the dignity of their honorable places. This country is rich and can well afford to pay such salaries to its officials as will enable them to

meet the requirements in their mode of living universally demanded by the people.

In my opinion, the amount proposed for their compensation is not sufficient. It is with much reluctance that I refrain from testing the sense of the House upon the question of fixing these salaries at a sum at least equal to the chief officials of one of the municipalities of the country. I withhold the amendment merely because, after consultation with those Members who have had the pending amendment under consideration for some time, it is deemed best to ask only for the amount proposed.

I understand that there will be presented other amendments increasing the compensation of members of the Cabinet from \$8,000 to \$12,000 and the compensation of Members of Congress from \$5,000 to \$7,500 a year. I shall vote for both amendments.

The compensation of Members of this House should be such as would enable them to maintain themselves and their families while in Washington in a mode of life as comfortable as that to which they are accustomed at their homes. I do not mean in the style of men of great or even large wealth. I refer to those men of limited means who live neither extravagantly nor luxuriously, but only in a manner that is respectable and at the same time befitting their positions as Members of this House. They can not do so upon the salary of \$5,000 a year without practicing economies that they should not be compelled to practice.

In the large cities of the country it is undoubtedly true that the cost of living is much greater than in other sections, and the demands upon the purse of Members are somewhat more burdensome. Knowing the conditions that a Representative from a large city has to meet, I know that the increase in salaries about to be proposed is reasonable and proper. I have hastily prepared a list of more than 150 officials of the city of New York, which I shall insert in the RECORD, who receive salaries of \$5,000 or more a year. The list by no means exhausts the number. Familiar as I am, after eight years' service in this House, with the responsibilities and duties of a Representative; knowing as I do the duties and responsibilities of many of the officials whom I shall enumerate, I assert with conviction that the salaries paid to Members of Congress are not at all commensurate with their duties, responsibilities, and the burdens which their official positions impose upon them. Convinced that the salaries should be increased, I shall support the amendment when offered. I am ready to vote what I believe to be a fair, proper, and decent compensation to those serving in the executive, judicial, and in the legislative departments of the Government. I shall vote for the amendments gladly and willingly, and I should do so even if I knew that the price of such a vote would be the termination of my career in this House. [Applause.]

SALARIES OF SOME OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK RECEIVING \$5,000 A YEAR OR MORE.

Mayor, \$15,000; mayor's secretary, \$5,000; president of the borough of Manhattan \$7,500, secretary to president Manhattan borough \$5,000; president borough of Brooklyn \$7,500, secretary \$4,000; president borough of Queens, \$5,000; president borough of Richmond, \$5,000; president board of aldermen, \$5,000; city clerk, \$7,000; first deputy, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$5,000; four coroners in the borough of Manhattan, each \$6,000; two coroners, borough of Bronx, each, \$6,000; two coroners, borough of Brooklyn, each \$6,000; comptroller \$15,000, two deputy comptrollers, each \$7,000, assistant deputy \$5,000; chief auditor, \$5,000; receiver of taxes, \$5,000; city paymaster, \$5,000; city chamberlain \$12,500, deputy chamberlain \$7,500; commissioner of public works borough of Manhattan \$6,000, assistant commissioner \$5,000; commissioner in Bronx, \$5,000; commissioner in Brooklyn, \$6,000; commissioner in Richmond, \$5,000; superintendent of highways Manhattan \$5,000, chief engineer \$6,000, superintendent in the Bronx \$4,000, in Brooklyn \$5,000; superintendent of sewers Manhattan \$5,000, chief engineer \$6,000, superintendent in the Bronx \$4,000, in Brooklyn \$5,000; superintendent of public buildings Manhattan \$5,000, in Brooklyn \$5,000; commissioner of water supply, gas, and electricity \$7,500, deputy \$6,000; commissioner of bridges \$7,500, deputy \$4,500; commissioner of street cleaning \$7,500, deputy \$5,000; commissioner of tenement-house department, \$7,500; commissioner of police \$7,500, deputy \$5,000; commissioner of health \$7,500, secretary \$5,000, sanitary chief \$5,000; corporation counsel \$15,000, two assistants at \$10,000, a number of assistants (at least fifteen) with salaries of more than \$5,000; chief bureau of recovery of penalties, \$5,000; fire commissioner \$7,500, deputy \$5,000; three park commissioners, at \$5,000 each; superintendent of buildings, \$5,000; president

of department of taxes \$8,000, six commissioners of taxes \$7,000 each; commissioner of charities \$7,500, deputy \$5,000; commissioner of corrections, \$7,500; commissioner of docks and ferries \$6,000, deputy \$4,500; commissioner of jurors, \$6,000; two commissioners of accounts, \$5,000 each; president civil-service commission \$6,000, two commissioners \$5,000 each; public administrator \$10,000, assistant \$5,000; superintendent of buildings in board of education, \$8,000; three commissioners of water supply \$12,000 each, secretary \$6,000; superintendent city record, \$5,000; four aqueduct commissioners \$5,000, chief engineer \$12,000; county clerk New York County \$15,000, deputy \$6,000; clerk of Kings County \$8,000, deputy \$5,000; sheriff of New York \$12,000 and one-half the fees, undersheriff \$5,000; sheriff in Kings County \$15,000, undersheriff \$6,000; register New York County \$12,000, deputy \$5,000; register Kings County \$8,000, deputy \$5,000; sheriff Richmond County, \$6,000; commissioner of records, Brooklyn, \$5,000; recorder, city judge, and three judges of general sessions, \$12,000; six justices of special sessions, \$9,000 each; fourteen city magistrates, at \$7,000 each; district attorney New York County \$12,000, eight assistants at \$7,500 each; district attorney Kings County \$10,000, one assistant \$7,000, two assistants \$6,000 each; in New York County about twenty justices of the supreme court, \$17,500 each; seven judges of the city court of New York, \$10,000; two surrogates, \$12,000; two county judges Kings County, \$12,500 each; surrogate, \$10,000; fifteen justices of supreme court in second judicial district, almost entirely within city of New York, \$17,500 each.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no personal objection to increasing the salaries of the members of the Cabinet, the Vice-President, the Speaker, or the other Members of the Senate and House, and sir, if there were not other interests of the country that are much more in need of national aid than the distinguished officials that I have just enumerated, and the condition of the Treasury justified it, I am free to say that by reason of the growing demands that are being made upon them because of the great increase of the cost of living I would vote for these amendments that are now being offered to this bill to increase their salaries. But, sir, that condition does not exist, and hence I am unalterably opposed to the increase of the salary of anyone that is now in the employ of the National Government in any capacity, with the single exception, perhaps, of the poorly paid rural mail carriers. The people of this country are clamoring for river and harbor improvement from one end of it to the other, and yet when they ask Congress to appropriate money for that purpose they are politely informed that the Treasury is in such a depleted condition that their projects, no matter how pressing and worthy, must wait until we get more money. They have had that old story poured into their ears for years, and they have believed that it was perhaps true, but right in the face of that pauperized answer to their requests we are met with a proposition to increase our own salaries 50 per cent. The river and harbor interests of the country have suffered for many long years, and the result of our neglect of them has caused the people of the country to be fairly robbed of millions of dollars per year because our waterways were not in a condition to furnish them with a water rate that would force the railroads to be reasonable and just in their charges. As long as that condition exists, as long as our finances are so low that we can not afford to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the worthy river and harbor projects of the country so as to give the toiling masses better and cheaper transportation facilities, we ought to blush to even think of increasing our own pay. I mention the river and harbor interests specifically, because, with me, the improvement of our rivers and harbors and the construction of proper and necessary canals is the great economic question of our time and should not be longer delayed. Sir, I will not vote one cent for the increase of salaries of public officials at this time, but I will gladly vote for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for river and harbor improvement at any moment of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other interests in our country that are much more in need of national aid than are our public officials, but the short time allotted to me in this discussion will not permit me to enumerate them. I will, therefore, content myself by asserting that they exist, and that any man of sense and justice can find them if he will try just a little. I know that each and every Member of this House can do so if he will take a trip over his district.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, the greatest evil connected with the legislation of our day and generation is to be found in the fact that our legislators are too prone to legislate "to give to him that hath and to take from him that hath not even that which he hath."

I deplore the inhuman spirit that prompts it and condemn the acts of all who practice it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 214, noes 51.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama demands the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-two gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following additional amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

New section to stand as section 7:

"On and after March 4, 1907, the compensation of heads of Executive Departments, who are members of the President's Cabinet, shall be at the rate of \$12,000 per annum."

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to make any extended comment on the submission of this amendment. The members of the President's Cabinet for nearly fifty years have received a compensation of \$8,000 per year. A dollar does not go as far to-day in the city of Washington as it did when this compensation was established. The requirements in official life, and in social life, warrant us at least in increasing this salary to \$12,000. Even this increase is not an attempt to make the salary adequate to services rendered, for no moderate salary would make such compensation. It has been suggested to me that while money does not go as far to-day in the city of Washington as it did fifty years ago it goes somewhat faster. Just to add a little bit to the interest of the question, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the Philadelphia Enquirer of Friday morning, December 14, is the picture of the president of the American Baseball League, and a notice to the effect that his salary has just been increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000 per year. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTAUER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman is aware that there is no place in the statutes where there is any recognition of the President's Cabinet. The gentleman in his amendment provides for an increase of salary for the heads of Departments who constitute the President's Cabinet. There is no definition in law as to what constitutes the President's Cabinet. Would it not be wiser to designate the nine secretaries—the heads of the various Departments—who, in fact, constitute the Cabinet?

Mr. LITTAUER. The language of the amendment carries that out—heads of Departments who are members of the President's Cabinet.

Mr. MANN. For instance, there is the head of the Department of Labor. So far as the law is concerned, there is nothing in the statutes to indicate whether he is a member of the Cabinet or not, because the statute does not recognize the Cabinet. The law has been invariably to fix the salary of the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Treasury, etc., at such an amount.

Mr. LITTAUER. I have no pride in this language, but if the gentleman will permit me to suggest, the head of the Department of Labor, as he designates him, should be called the head of the Bureau of Labor.

Mr. MANN. Well, I beg the gentleman's pardon; the law says that there shall be a Department of Labor with a Commissioner at the head of it. The Bureau of Commerce and Labor calls it a bureau, but that is in violation of the statute.

Mr. LITTAUER. I am quite willing to accept any amendment which will carry out this intent, which is that the compensation of heads of Executive Departments, who are members of the President's Cabinet, shall be compensated at this salary. I do not believe such designation can ever be misunderstood.

Mr. DALZELL. Why have any doubt about it?

Mr. LITTAUER. There is none, to my mind.

Mr. MANN. Why not designate the nine Secretaries who are now members of the so-called "Cabinet?"

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I would like to ask my colleague from New York whether or not he has any more resolutions?

Mr. LITTAUER. I decidedly have, and one that deals with salaries of Members of Congress and Senators. [Applause.]

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is that the only additional one?

Mr. LITTAUER. That will be the only additional one it is my present purpose to offer, and the only one that unanimous consent, under which we are now acting, authorizes.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 204, noes 60.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question was again taken; and 33 gentlemen arising in favor thereof, not a sufficient number, the yeas and nays were refused. [Applause.]

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a final amendment. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and Delegates from Territories shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, which compensation shall be in lieu of all other pay and allowance except actual individual traveling expenses from their homes to the seat of Government and return, by the most direct route of usual travel, once for each session of the House to which such Senator, Member, or Delegate belongs, to be certified to under his hand to the disbursing officer and filed as a voucher.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, first a word of explanation as to the amendment.

Mr. KEIFER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LITTAUER. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to ask the gentleman whether the purpose of this amendment is to take away, in case the salary is increased to \$7,500, all pay for clerks as well?

Mr. LITTAUER. Decidedly not. I was about to state that the purpose of this amendment is to raise the salary of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates from \$5,000 a year to \$7,500 a year and not to interfere with the clerical service allowed nor the stationery allowance made, but only to wipe out the present provision in reference to mileage and in place thereof to pay actual expenses in traveling to and from each session of Congress.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from New York is quite clear as to his purpose. I would like to have the amendment read so that we may pass upon the effect of it ourselves, as there seems to be some doubt among the Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. KEIFER and Mr. LIVINGSTON rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield further to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEIFER. I do not want to be captious, but as I understand the language as read I think the purpose of the mover is made different from that which he states he intends, and I think where there is so much doubt it would be better to put it in shape so that we will not misunderstand the matter.

Mr. LITTAUER. I think that I can correct any misapprehension there may be here by submitting an amendment in a new form rather than in the one read from the desk.

I would offer a new amendment to read, "Which compensation shall be in lieu of all mileage," thereby taking out of the amendment other pay and allowance.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. I call his attention to the fact that this is merely not an appropriation, but the enactment of a law. The gentleman does not fix the date when this goes into operation. Consequently he would change the law as to compensation from the date of the approval of this act, which might be next week. Consequently he changes the compensation and strikes out the mileage of the present Congress.

Mr. LITTAUER. It was my purpose to call the attention of the House to that very matter, and my purpose to leave the time in which this shall become effective to be determined by the House.

Mr. LACEY. If this amendment was adopted in its present form, it would be immediately operative.

Mr. LITTAUER. I believe as a part of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill it would not be operative until the 1st of July next.

Mr. LACEY. This is not a part of the legislative bill. It becomes a law. The appropriation would not be operative, but any law we put in this bill is immediately operative as soon as approved.

Mr. LITTAUER. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is correct.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman have the right to withdraw under the rules the amendment he offered, and submit the other one.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to withdraw the amendment and offer the following.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and Delegates from Territories shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, which compensation shall be in lieu of all mileage except actual individual traveling expenses from their homes to the seat of government and return by the most direct route of usual travel, once for each session of the House to which such Senator, Member, or Delegate belongs, to be certified to under his hand to the disbursing officer and filed as a voucher.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the compensation named in this amendment shall not be paid each Senator and Member prior to March 4, 1909.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] that the amendment would be better if it came in at the beginning—that "on and after March 4, 1909," the compensation shall be as follows, and so forth.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I have no pride in my amendment, except—

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest that to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I have no pride whatever in the form of the amendment. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] shall phrase it as he sees fit, provided its purpose is not altered.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman, then, that he insert, after the word "that," at the commencement of the amendment offered by the gentleman, "on and after the 4th of March."

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. On and after March 4, 1909.

Mr. MUDD rose.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be captious as to language.

The SPEAKER. The amendment, as the Chair understands, is now being modified, and will be reported as soon as modified. Therefore the Chair would ask that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] suspend a moment until the amendment as modified is reported. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On and after March 4, 1909, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and Delegates from Territories shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, which compensation shall be in lieu of all mileage except actual individual traveling expenses from their homes to the seat of government and return by the most direct route of usual travel, once for each session of the House to which such Senator, Member, or Delegate belongs, to be certified to under his hand to the disbursing officer and filed as a voucher.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, just a word. I do not wish to be captious as to language, but if you use the language "on and after," you will pay the increased salary for the February of the Sixtieth Congress. It would seem to be a small matter, but it makes some difference. If we say "on and after" the 4th day of March, 1909, we will make the increase apply to a part of the Sixtieth Congress, which it is not the purpose of those of us who favor this postponement of the operation of the law to do.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Sixtieth Congress will expire on the 4th of March, 1909? It expires on the 3d of March.

Mr. MUDD. If that be conceded, the language as it now stands will be correct. I only want to make sure that we do not provide that the increase of salary shall take effect during the Sixtieth Congress.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to a question; I do not care to yield the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wanted to address myself to this resolution.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield such time as the gentleman may desire.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I only care to take five minutes.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore stated my objection to this resolution, my objection to increasing the salary of the membership of this House, and I have nothing more to say in regard to that question, except to reply to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], wherein he cited the salaries of certain officials in New York City to evidence the reason why our salary should be increased. The cost of living varies in different parts of the United States. The cost of renting a small home in New York City would be as much as the cost of renting a very handsome house in my town. The cost of provisions, the cost of clothing, the cost of everything in a big city like New York is much greater than it would be in a large portion of this country. It is very much greater than in the city of Washington. And there is no comparison of salary which is just and fair along those lines. The gentleman may as well compare the salary of the officers in Alabama or some other State in the Union. The governor of Alabama only receives \$5,000 a year; the judges of the supreme court only \$4,000 a year; the circuit judges \$3,000 a year, and, I believe, the secretary of State only \$2,500 a year. It is not a question of comparison. I think the people of the United States are willing to pay their Representatives in Congress a fair and reasonable salary to compensate for their coming to Washington, but it is not expected that a salary should be paid that a man can make money on or get rich on. I do not think there is anyone who can deny the fact that a man who lives within reasonable lines can live on the salary now paid Members of Congress, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe my constituency would justify me in voting for more.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this proposition to increase the compensation of Members and Senators from five to seven thousand five hundred dollars, but at the same time I was very glad to vote to increase the compensation of the Speaker, the Vice-President, and members of the Cabinet. I think, however, that upon reflection we will see that their position presents a case entirely different from that of the Members of this House. The public duties of these officials, to say nothing of the social demands made upon the Speaker, the Vice-President, and members of the Cabinet, are such as to entitle them to an increase of compensation. With the Members of Congress, however, it seems to me that the case is entirely different. If we were to attempt to make the compensation of the Members of this House adequate to the income which many of them renounced in coming here, the amount should be much larger than \$7,500. If those who favor this proposed increase do so as an effort to make the pay of Members at all adequate to the earning capacity of Members, it seems to me they are looking at membership in this House from an entirely wrong point of view. This House, Mr. Speaker, considering the character of the relations which Members of it bear to the people, and in view of the power and influence of this Republic, is easily the greatest legislative body that ever assembled. Membership in this House is the greatest honor ever conferred upon a man by a free electorate. The compensation, therefore, such as it is, should be regarded almost in full, if not entirely as an honorarium. I am opposed to the increase in the pay of the secretaries of Members provided for in this bill, for there are many employees of the Government now receiving inadequate pay, such as the post-office clerks, who, I think, are entitled to the first consideration, and I am opposed to this increase in the pay of Members on the theory of making it equal to the income which even the average Members of this House renounced in coming here.

My view of the matter is this: That by any attempt to make membership of this House desirable on account of the money reward you thereby diminish the honor of service in this eminent body. By increasing the pay you lessen the distinction. I feel sure as I look around me here that there are many Members in this great body who at large personal sacrifice to themselves would make an effort to come here even if there were no compensation at all. I see before me business and professional men, many of whom I know personally, have renounced incomes several times the sum of \$7,500 for the privilege and the honor of serving their constituencies as Members of this body.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. I have only a few moments, but I yield with pleasure for a question.

Mr. SIMS. In order to increase the honor, suppose you knock all the salary out?

Mr. BOUTELL. I am free to say, in reply to the gentleman

from Tennessee, that while it is as hard for me to get along on the \$5,000 as it is for most of the Members, even if the present compensation were taken away, I should make a desperate effort by pinching and skimping and greater economy to still retain my membership in this House, so great do I regard the honor. [Applause.]

But, as I look upon it, you diminish the honor by attempting to make the money payment any adequate or full compensation for the Members of this House. And so, regarding the question in this light, while I was very glad to give my assent to the other increases, I am not willing to join in an effort to make the pecuniary compensation of Members equal to the earning capacity of the average Members of this House.

I like to feel that the money payment to the Members is still, in the larger sense, an honorarium, and that membership in this House is to be regarded more as an honor than as a means of deriving an income. Therefore I shall vote against this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNWELL. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BOUTELL. I regret that my time is up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. About five minutes.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to this question from the standpoint of a poor Member of Congress. Poverty is not a crime, nor ought it be a deterrent to official place under the Government. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, when men are leaving the service of their country, retiring to private life, solely because the salary which they receive in their official positions is inadequate to maintain them, and they see in the future years ahead poverty for their children and want in their old age. I believe in dealing with this question from the standpoint of right. Are the salaries inadequate? Are they commensurate with the station and the duty to be performed? If they are not, then they ought to be increased, no matter if others would come here from our districts and gladly accept the position for less pay.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I come from a district that I know will stand by me in this increase of salary. My people are in favor of decent pay for these positions. While it is true, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, that it is a high and honorable place, the Government of the United States ought not to require the services of any citizen without pay commensurate to the services performed. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are not ten men on this floor who, in private conversation, will not say, "The salary is inadequate, the increase is right," but, some say, "I can not afford to vote for it." [Applause.] If the time ever comes while I am a Member of this House that I look upon any proposition as being right, and yet I am afraid to vote for it, I will tender my resignation and go home. [Applause.] I intend, as long as I am here, to vote my convictions as my limited ability will give me the light. And you all know that it is utterly impossible to maintain a family in the city of Washington, with all of your other expenses, on the present salary. Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen leave their families at home because they are not able to bring them here. I would not come here for a Senatorship if I had to remain for six or seven months separated from the wife of my bosom and the children of my loins. [Applause.] The Government does not require it. The newspapers of the country, representing public sentiment, are demanding this increase, and they are branding us with not having the courage to vote for it. If it is right Mr. Speaker, that this increase should take effect in the Congress to begin on March 4, 1909, it is right that it should take effect in the Congress to begin on March 4, 1907. [Applause.] And I intend, if this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is voted down, to offer an amendment fixing the taking effect of this law at the beginning of the next session of Congress. [Applause.] That is the time when it ought to take effect, and the sentiment "I can not vote for it because I am increasing my own salary" is a mere subterfuge, by which you can not deceive the American people. They know that the vast majority of the Members of this House consider that the salary is inadequate and that it ought to be increased. You can not fool them. They know that you want it, and they know that some gentlemen here will vote against it, while at the selfsame moment their hearts are silently sending up prayers to the good Lord that it may pass. [Laughter.]

In my State, Mr. Speaker, we have a constitution adopted in 1885. That constitution provides for biennial sessions of the legislature. It provides that members of the legislature shall not receive more than \$6 per day, and 10 cents a mile in going and returning from the capital. During the twenty-one years

that that constitution has been in force—and every session fixes its own pay—propositions have been offered at \$3 a day, \$4 a day, \$5 a day, and not a single legislature has ever met that they did not wind up by fixing it at the maximum—\$6 a day and 10 cents a mile. We increased last year the salary of the governor from \$3,500 to \$5,000, and built a mansion for him to live in. We have increased the salaries of the judges and the State attorneys, and all down the line, because our people recognize the great increase in the cost of living that has been brought about by this era of marvelous prosperity.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. With \$7,500 and the mileage taken out and the actual expenses given for 386 Members of the House, will that be practically any more expense to the Government in the way of a tax than the present salary of \$5,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have no doubt that it will not be.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is so, for I have figured it out.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is true that a seat in this great legislative body is a great and distinguished honor, well worthy the ambition of any citizen of the Republic; but if you fix the compensation so low that a man of moderate means can not, in justice to his family, remain here, you absolutely close the "door of hope" to every poor man in all the land, and you deliver the law-making power into the hands of the rich and powerful. So great is the honor of being a Member of this House that men have, in the past, sacrificed their personal interests to remain here; they are sacrificing their personal interests to-day, and as long as the laudable ambition to serve one's country finds lodgment in the breast of the American citizen, sacrifices to reach here and to remain will continue to be made. But, Mr. Speaker, all this is no argument against an increase of salary for the membership of this body. I represent upon this floor as enlightened, intelligent, and progressive a constituency as exists anywhere throughout the broad domain of this great Republic, and I am quite sure that my people do not wish me to pursue a course that would close the door to a seat in the Congress in the face of the poorest man who lives within the borders of the great district which I have the distinguished honor at the present time to represent. While I may be criticised from certain quarters for the position I am now taking—and, indeed, I expect it—yet I am happy in the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that the reign of the demagogue is at an end in the State of Florida, and our people can no longer be misled by the senseless ranting of the "sand-lot" orator. Florida has her face set toward the morning of this new day of progress and is endeavoring to keep step with the music of our wonderful national prosperity. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTWELL], for whose opinions I have the very highest respect, suggests that the matter of compensation should not be considered, and that even if there was no salary at all gentlemen would make a desperate effort to retain their seats in this body. Mr. Speaker, none but the wealthy could afford to do that, and if such provision of law should obtain you would soon witness in this free Republic a House of Representatives composed entirely of very rich individuals, some of whom may have made their fortunes by their own activities, some of whom may have inherited it, and some of whom may have married it, but every one of them, in all probability, far removed from the common people of our land.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed absolutely to the payment of salaries of Members by indirection. For God's sake let us answer the great daily papers, who are challenging our courage. You know that the salary is inadequate; you say it is inadequate; you say that this is not wrong. Then I appeal to you to go upon the record by your votes before all the country. [Applause.]

I will print as a part of my remarks the following clippings:

[Washington Times, December 8, 1906.]

INCREASING SALARIES.

It will be a wonder if the Congressional movement for a reasonable increase in Government salaries doesn't somewhere go down on a rock of bigotry or demagoguery. Salaries are notoriously inadequate in Government service. But it will be surprising if Congress proves it has courage enough to do the right thing and increase them.

It would be better if salaries of Congressmen and Senators had not been brought in for consideration at the same session with other salaries. Congress could have granted, for instance, increases of pay in the Army and Navy without fear. Then, later on, Congressmen and Senators could have been given their due. As it is, additions to other salaries will look like a sop to distract attention from the 50 per cent addition to Congressional salaries.

There is no objection to the \$7,500 salary for Congressmen and Senators. They ought to have it. But they ought to have the courage to vote it to themselves because it is right. They ought not to sneak it in under the shelter of a general salary-increasing movement. Things have changed since the time when, a generation ago, Congress increased its own salaries, and there was a chorus of protest which culminated in the retirement to private life on that one issue of most of the Members of the lower House and a number of Senators.

The country is now rich instead of poor; it has grown away from the notion that personal debts are an essential preliminary to high thinking.

[The Washington Post, Wednesday, December 12, 1906.]

LET SALARIES BE RAISED.

The House of Representatives has an excellent opportunity at this time to prove its courage and candor. It believes that the salaries of Representatives and Senators should be increased to \$7,500, to keep pace with the increased cost of living. But there may be some members who are afraid to act, and there may be others who, in the hope of currying favor at home as economists, will make a point of order against the increase.

If the amendment is ruled out on a point of order, the House should have the courage to pass a bill making the increase of salary. Its course would be commended by the people. There is no question of the inadequacy of Congressional pay. There may be question, however, of the frankness and courage of Representatives if they falter and dodge on this subject. The whole world despises a man who is afraid to stand up for his own rights.

While the House is raising the pay of its own Members, it should, of course, take cognizance of the underpaid Government clerks whose only hope of relief is from Congress. The Congressmen can help themselves, and if they increase their pay 50 per cent there will be no complaint. But if they ignore other Government employees while helping themselves, their action may be adversely criticised.

The time has come when salaries should be increased. Can not Congress attack this subject with breadth of view and candor and courage?

[The Washington Post, Sunday, December 9, 1906.]

INCREASE OF SALARIES.

The House of Representatives feels the sting of prosperity. Like all other salaried people, the Members of the House discover that it is difficult to make both ends meet with the price of living steadily increasing. It is accordingly proposed that an amendment shall be offered to the legislative appropriation bill increasing the salaries of Representatives to \$7,500 a year. This is a reasonable readjustment, which will meet with the approval of the country. If the House agrees to the amendment, it is presumed that the Senate will insert a similar amendment, increasing the salary of Senators to the same figure.

While Congress is considering the salary question what a splendid opportunity is offered to do justice to clerks of the Government. The employees in the Executive Departments are in the same position as the poor Congressmen. They, too, are stretched on the rack of low salaries and high prices. Their salaries have not been adjusted for many years, during which time the cost of living has enormously increased. They were recently required to do extra work every day at the same old pay, but beyond this trifling attention no notice has been bestowed upon them by Congress. Working for a pittance, as most of them are, a little relief would be far more important to them than to Congressmen. The people of the country are not unjust taskmasters. If they could express themselves upon this subject, it is certain that they would direct Congress to readjust the pay of Government employees to conform to conditions created by prosperity.

The Members of Congress propose to increase their pay 50 per cent. It is not too much. But can they do it with a clear conscience if at the same time they refuse to increase the pay of Government clerks, who are infinitely worse off and to whom an increase of even 10 per cent would be a Godsend? There is no necessity for labored investigations upon which to base such action. The clerks are in classes, and a brief paragraph would be sufficient to cover the matter. The salaries of clerks, in other words, can be increased as easily as the salaries of Congressmen.

Now is the time, gentlemen of Congress, to recognize the fact that prosperity brings its obligations.

[Philadelphia Inquirer, December 8, 1906.]

MORE PAY FOR CONGRESSMEN.

This is the time for Members of Congress to vote themselves a respectable compensation for their services. Already several bills have been introduced looking to the payment of \$7,500 a year, while the salaries of the Speaker and the Vice-President are proportionately advanced. There is no sense in evading the necessities of the case any longer, and it is evidently much better for Congress to take action now rather than after the already elected body meets for the Sixtieth Congress.

The bill ought to be entitled "A bill to permit a poor man to run for Congress." The present sum of \$5,000 a year would be reasonable enough if it meant that the Member had that amount to devote to his personal expenses. The fact is that most of the Members are called upon to pay large election expenses. They can not escape them, and probably in all contested districts one year's compensation actually goes for those expenses which the law recognizes as proper. This is only a part of the cost of representing a district.

In Washington the cost of living is high enough—so high that Senator Hoar, one of the best men who ever sat at Washington, lived for almost forty years in a boarding house. He was fortunate in representing a constituency which did not require a great deal of patting on the head. But there are few Members to-day who do not have to go down in their pockets almost daily to pay the fares of constituents or to help out those who are in trouble and are stranded in Washington.

In 1874 Congress raised the salary to \$7,500, but committed the mistake of making it retroactive. The present Congress can give the coming Members of the next Congress the added compensation with the assurance that the people will gladly submit. They want to have a law that will not make it essential to select men of accumulated fortune. We desire good men and we wish them to be as independent as possible.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois addressed an argument to the House which appeals with great force to many of its Members. I believe that some Members will vote in the belief that his argument is decisive; and yet I venture to assert that it is based upon a wrong premise.

One has only to look at the statute which created the salary of Members in the beginning to realize that it was fixed upon the idea of the value of service and not as an honorarium;

that it was fixed to enable Members to live decently in Washington and enjoy the ordinary comforts of life. Otherwise such a salary as \$5,000 a year would not have been fixed in 1866, when \$5,000 was more than \$10,000 is to-day.

Therefore it seems to me that the idea of service being rendered for an honorarium must be dismissed from the case, and we must act on the idea of service being rewarded with adequate compensation.

Now, if we proceed upon the theory propounded by the gentleman from Illinois, to be logical we should abolish all salaries, for then the patriotism and honor of the service would not be diminished by a single dollar. Then we would serve, as members of the British Parliament do, without any compensation whatever. And yet, what do we find as the result of that system across the water? You might take the case of the Irish members of Parliament. There are about 100 Nationalists in that house, and they receive no salary; but men of their blood upon this side of the Atlantic are constantly called upon to contribute money to enable these Nationalist members to live. They are the very flower of the Irish race; they give up professions and other splendid careers to serve their country in a Parliament where questions of patriotism are more frequently raised than in the American Congress. These men sacrifice splendid careers for patriotism pure and simple. They are interested in one question only, and that is home rule for the land of their birth. And yet men of their own country and men of their blood in other lands realize that this is a material, bread and butter world after all, and that if you wish to possess a soul you must link it with a body, the body must be fed, the body must be clothed, and the body must be housed. So it becomes a practical question, the very identical question which was presented to the men of 1866 when \$5,000 was fixed as a salary proper to be paid to the Members of Congress.

The same question arises to-day. What is adequate compensation for the Members of Congress? Will anyone contend that \$5,000 to-day is sufficient to pay the expenses of living and all the other expenses which a man must incur as soon as he accepts this office? No reasonable man who has lived in this city will make that assertion to-day. What, then, is the duty of the House? To raise the salary to such a level as will afford a decent living to its Members and attract the best and the ablest men to its service. There are two classes of men who will vote on this proposition. One class will vote upon the line of reasoning laid down by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], namely, that this service is so honorable that it ought not to be diminished by an increase of salary. But there is another class of men, I venture to say, who, from the instinct of self-preservation, will vote against this increase. Mediocrity, Mr. Speaker, has always found its greatest defense in small compensation. So long as salaries are low mediocrity is safe, and a certain number of gentlemen in this House, in order to preserve their places, will not vote to raise salaries, because they know that an increase of salary will invite to competition with themselves men better qualified to serve in the Congress of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] There are lawyers whose only means of living is found in the fact that bar associations have not framed rules and statutes have not been enacted which fix uniform rates for the trial of cases in court. Suppose a statute were to pass giving to attorneys \$500 for the trial of each case. There are gentlemen who would never try another case in the course of their lives. The cases would then be tried by the ablest members at the bar. The protection of these poor members is found in the small compensation for which they are ready to serve. I believe that will be a potent argument when addressed to some Members of this House; and right in that connection let me say that everyone knows now that the greatest advantage which a district can have is found not always in the natural ability of its Member, but in the experience which that Member acquires. Even after the space of two terms one finds that he can accomplish with great facility what he would find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish in his first term.

He acquires the means of knowing the various channels and avenues of legislation. He knows whether it is going to be legislative economy or legislative waste for him to attempt a certain line of work, and his district gets the value of that experience. But by the time the Member has acquired that experience his family has increased in number, his expenses have increased in proportion, and then he meets a practical problem—"Can I afford to stay here any longer?" Every instinct demands that he should stay. There are Members of this House who are going out now because they can not afford to stay any longer. If they could afford to stay and provide bread and

clothing and decent housing for their families, they would stay here and become useful Members—useful alike to their country and to their districts. But the great value of the experience which they would acquire is entirely lost by reason of the inadequacy of the compensation, which results in forcing them out. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] has said that we can not afford to inaugurate a scheme based upon the capacity of Members. Of course not. Capacity is different according to the Members. There are no two men in the whole world absolutely equal in point of capacity. There are Members of this House who, if paid the actual value of their services, would receive not five, but twenty-five thousand dollars a year. There are other Members of this House who, if paid by the same standard of measurement, would not receive, in my judgment, more than \$1,000 a year. [Laughter and applause.] But we can not frame a law based upon the capacity of individual Members. We must make the law hard and inelastic, and therefore the only thing to do is to raise the salary to that reasonable level which will allow all men at least an opportunity to exist, and thus give to some of our ablest, though needy, Members a means of keeping the wolf from the door. Then their natural ambition and patriotism will compel them to stay here and sacrifice the larger pecuniary rewards which unquestionably they could reap in private service.

Now, take the condition of city districts, and I urge that particularly upon the attention of the House. I say, Mr. Speaker, that unless salaries are raised you will have in a few years but two classes of men coming from the great cities of this great country to represent their people in the Congress of the United States. One will be the rich and leisure class. The other will be the professional politician who has worked his devious way up from ward heeler to councilman, from councilman to alderman, from alderman to local representative, and thence to Congressman of the United States. Yet you will find that such a man very frequently has no visible means of support, and is a creature who lives by his wits and by his wits alone. Nevertheless if the compensation is not increased the great cities of this country will be represented by those two classes, and those two classes exclusively. Is that an inviting prospect for the Members of this House? Will you have your great cities represented by the idle rich who came here—most of them for mere pastime, some of them I grant to give the country the benefit of their splendid talents and their leisure—but some of whom also come here in order to be relieved of the ennui which inflicts itself upon them every day of their lives. Will you be pleased with the prospect of having your great cities represented by the idle rich and by the cheap professional politician? The middleman by this standard of compensation will be excluded because he must provide decently for himself and for his family. His first duty, I insist, is to his family. Unless this compensation can be raised that middle class must be excluded from the privilege of occupying a place in the Congress of the United States.

I address these remarks to the House in the hope that the Members will be governed by practical considerations—by the same considerations which would influence the proprietor of a factory or the manager of a railroad who sought to provide decent service for the public. If these considerations are given effect, I am confident that the proposition of the gentleman from New York will be passed here by an overwhelming vote. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LITTAUER. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Twenty minutes.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR].

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the proposed increase of the salaries of Members of this House either for the Sixtieth Congress or for the Sixty-first Congress. If it were to go into effect for the Sixtieth Congress it would be Members of this House practically voting upon raising their own salaries, for many Members of this House are Members of the Sixtieth Congress. I shall debate it squarely upon the proposition of raising the salary at all. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to any man upon the floor of this House entertaining a very large or a very small estimate of his own abilities. I neither belong to the rich class, nor do I know anything of the conditions of ward politics so accurately set out by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN]. I come from an agricultural district, where, although I am a lawyer by profession and have been honored with the high office in my State of attorney-general, I could not make exceeding \$5,000 in the little town in which I live by my profession. This House is constituted practically of three classes of membership—one very rich, who do not need any raise of salaries at all; another

class, who represent railway and other corporations in addition to being Members of this House, and do not need any raise of salary at all; and the other class are those who can not make more than \$5,000 a year in the communities in which they live. The people in my district, I do not believe, would tolerate my voting for any increase of the salaries of Members of Congress. To-day the lumber men, the vegetable men, tobacco men, fruit men, and farmers generally in the district I represent are pressed and injured by extortionate railway rates and charges. And this House of Representatives, neither Democrats nor Republicans, has not passed an adequate law to protect the interests of the people who sent me here, and I will not cast a vote to raise either my own salary or the salary of Members of this House collectively when this House has declined to pass a fair, just, and adequate statute that will protect the interests of which I speak.

Mr. Speaker, some of the railways in my district are capitalized at two, three, and four times their value. Every article shipped out of my county, every article shipped out of my district, every article shipped into my county, every article shipped into my district, is unjustly taxed by the gross, fraudulent device of overcapitalization of the railroads. Whether \$7,500 per annum be an adequate compensation for Members or not, I place one serious objection to it upon the ground that this House, without regard to party, did not, when it had an opportunity to do so, pass a fair, just, and adequate law that will protect the people whom I have the honor here to represent. Whether \$5,000 per annum be adequate or not, let me state what a distinguished Member of this House said to me once. Several Members were standing around and talking about the sacrifices men had to make to come to Congress and speaking of the inadequacy of the pay of Congressmen.

"Well," said this gentleman, "LAMAR, do you believe these Pickwickian stories?" I said, "Well, I do not know. I am inclined to doubt some of them." Said he, "I do not believe a word. I do not know how it is with other men, but this is the softest snap I have ever struck in my life."

Mr. Speaker, I would not minimize this question by either reflecting upon the motives of the man who wanted to vote for it or upon the motives of the man who wanted to vote against it. I place my vote squarely upon the ground that the Third Congressional district in my State will not tolerate a vote raising my salary, or the salaries of other Members, when to this time I have not succeeded in getting legislation out of this House that will protect them against extortionate, overcapitalized, fraudulent railroad rates. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment now pending is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment I offered. With the consent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I would withdraw the amendment and offer this substitute with a perfection of language to carry out the intention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a substitute for his substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York proposes to modify his amendment, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. HULL. Let it be reported, so we will understand it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] desires to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I do, because I have seen the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] having withdrawn his amendment, the gentleman from New York withdraws his amendment and offers the following, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the amendment, the one which has now been offered, open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will be after it is read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert a new section, to stand as section 8, and to read as follows: "On and after March 4, 1909, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioners from Porto Rico shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, and in lieu of mileage now authorized by law, they shall each be allowed and paid actual individual traveling expenses from their homes to the seat of government and return, by the most direct route of usual travel, once for each session of the House to which such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner belongs, to be certified to under his hand to the disbursing officer and filed as a voucher."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out the figure "9" and put "7" in it, so as to read "1907" instead of "1909."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "1909" and insert "1907;" so that it will read:

"On and after March 4, 1907, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioners from Porto Rico, shall be at the rate of \$7,500 per annum, and in lieu of mileage now authorized by law they shall each be allowed and paid actual individual traveling expenses from their homes to the seat of government and return, by the most direct route of usual travel, once for each session of the House to which such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner belongs, to be certified to under his hand to the disbursing officer, and filed as a voucher."

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want five minutes.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to the gentleman two minutes. There is a general desire to get to a vote.

Mr. SIMS. Only two minutes on such a good amendment as this?

Mr. LITTAUER. Five minutes, then.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I have offered this amendment for this reason: There is no justification for increase of salary to commence two years ahead that does not now exist, and if the conditions now existing are such as to justify increasing salaries to commence more than two years from now, they certainly do justify an increase to commence with the beginning of the next Congress. [Applause.] And the people will not be fooled. When a man who votes for this increase to be made in 1909 runs for the Sixty-first Congress he will be met with some man who will be in favor of repealing it, and if he says that he is in favor of repeal—I mean the man who votes for it now—he will be in a hole anyway. [Laughter.] And if he is in favor of repealing it he does it alone upon the ground that conditions then existing justify it. If the expense of living has so increased, as has been stated here, to justify an increase of salary, it certainly ought to be made logically, and that is, to relieve the conditions that demand this legislation.

Why, some of my Republican friends say that in 1909 the Democrats may be in power, that there will be a panic, and that prices will have gone down; then, of course, we would no longer need the increase, as the cost of living would be a great deal less. In reply to that I will say that in 1909, when we have all the trusts busted, the prices will have gone down, and then we will not need it. Why not say what we want instead of expecting the Senate to do what we have not the courage to do. If I were a Senator, and this amendment goes through this way, you should keep it, because it is an expression of this House, and it is either just and proper now to adopt this amendment or not. You can not know what the conditions will be in 1909.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the gentleman justifies his proposition on the statement that if it is needed at all it is needed now.

Mr. SIMS. In the next Congress.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think it ought to apply from now, the present Congress?

Mr. SIMS. No; to the Sixtieth Congress. My amendment only applies to that.

Mr. MANN. The Sixtieth Congress will not take its seat for a year.

Mr. SIMS. But the 4th of March will take its seat before that. [Great laughter.]

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. We were elected to the Sixtieth Congress at a salary of \$5,000 a year. The salary was fixed at that amount. Now, does the gentleman think it right to vote to increase the salary when we have already been elected?

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman think it is right to stickle over increasing his salary for next Congress when he expects to make the Senator vote for \$7,500 a year for an unexpired portion of his term? If the proposition of the gentleman is right, Senators can not vote for the proposition to increase for 1909, as he has been elected. What will your Senator have to do whose time does not expire until after 1909? If you want to make it so it will not apply to one who is in office, you will have to make it apply six years from now. Yet a few minutes ago we voted to make the Speaker's increased salary begin on the 4th day of March, 1907. He certainly is a Member of this House, and that vote was right.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman understands that the Speaker has not been elected.

Mr. SIMS. That is the hugest joke I ever heard. [Great laughter.] Where is the Republican on that side of the House who is going to vote for anybody but JOSEPH G. CANNON for

Speaker? [Laughter and applause.] That is one of the meritorious reasons for the increase [renewed applause], because you know who you are going to get, and the country knows it. [Renewed applause.] Now, I have no doubt that there are men in this House of large fortune or men who can go out and get \$100 or \$150 a day lecturing. Maybe they do not need it, but they ought not to crowd out from this House those who can not live here without an increase. They ought to think of those who need this increase.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yesterday Senator TILLMAN said to me: "If I remained in Congress and had to live on my salary and could not lecture, I would starve. I could not take care of my family."

Mr. SIMS. Who would do anything to cause Senator TILLMAN to starve? [Great laughter.] If this increase does not apply to the Sixtieth Congress, I shall vote against it, as I can not possibly know what conditions will prevail in 1909.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended twenty minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will not prevail. It seems to me there is a marked difference between voting for the amendment as proposed by him and voting for the amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York. Every Member here who was elected to the Sixtieth Congress is under an implied contract with his constituents at home to serve for two years for the stipulated salary now in the law. He made his canvass, he asked for their votes, he received their indorsement on the supposition that they as taxpayers would remunerate him at the stipulated salary then understood by all parties. To vote to increase the salary for a Congress for which we made that canvass and were indorsed on that proposition does not seem entirely fair to the people we represent. After the next Congress expires, the man who votes for the amendment of the gentleman from New York or votes against it, as he sees fit, goes back to the people who sent him here for their indorsement. But to vote for that increase now would be to take advantage of our position here to increase the salary for a term to which most of us were elected, but have not yet entered upon.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to make an inquiry?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I fully appreciate the point the gentleman makes, but suppose, now, that we send this proposition to the Senate. Two-thirds of that body are always members, one-third going out every two years, so that the two-thirds that remain will be obliged to vote on the question of raising or fixing their own salaries, regardless of the date which we fix for the taking effect of this amendment, unless you put it a number of years ahead. Then among the members of the Senate now a large number will be reelected to the Senate, just as you and I are reelected to the House.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will answer the gentleman by saying that we are only responsible for our own acts.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, I appreciate that.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. And not for those of the Senate. Conditions are different there from what they are here. If there were like conditions existing here, the objections I now make might not lie, because they could not be made with corresponding force.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa five minutes.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York does not take effect until the terms of all the present Members of this Congress will expire, so that each Member is in a position to vote upon this proposition upon precisely the same footing, whether he is a Member of the Sixtieth Congress or not. I believe that the compensation for this office should largely be the honor that is in it. The salary ought to be sufficient to pay living expenses, but no man should be put in the position of seeking a seat in Congress merely for the salary, and any attempt to make this compensation desirable merely because of its amount will depreciate the character of the membership of this House. When the Members of this House were paid \$1,500 a year, and also when they

were paid \$8 a day for the time actually spent by them in this body, the House certainly had a membership as high in character and ability as it has ever had since. By increasing the compensation, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN], you make it attractive to the very class of men that he says ought to be excluded from Congress. The ward heeler, the professional politician, who he says now often gets into Congress, would in fact seek a seat here for the money that is in it. At present the compensation is adequate to support any Member in a decent way, not in affluence, not in luxury, but in a fairly decent manner. He has to spend about six months each year in this city. The other six months he spends in his private affairs or spends partly in his campaign, as the case may be. But a Member of this body, as a rule, keeps in touch with affairs at home. He must do so, because the salary is not sufficient to justify him in abandoning wholly his home affairs.

Now, to provide a salary such as will induce men to seek the office for the salary that is in it, and to wholly abandon their own business at home, giving themselves up entirely to a Congressional career for the compensation involved, will depreciate the character of its membership. Look at the men we have had in this body in the past—men who have come here at the sacrifice of money, but who feel that they have been compensated by the honor of the position to which their people elected them. I for one believe that we had better keep the salary where it is. The French deputies get \$3,000 a year. The members of the English Parliament receive no compensation whatever. The Members of this body receive barely a sufficient amount to support them while serving in the duties of the office. To keep it at that would retain the membership of this body at its present standard, which I believe to be a high standard. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA].

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]. For one I am opposed to the increase of salary for the Members of this or the other House. I am, however, amused to see how popular this question is. I am glad to see that for once members of the two great political parties of the nation can get together. It must be a very meritorious measure in order to appeal to so many of the Members with all the patriotism which they have. It is evident that it will pass, but I want to say to you that for one I shall vote against it. As a farmer, coming from the West, I know that we can live much cheaper than the people who come from the great cities of the East.

But remember, during our term of two years we are here only about ten months and receive a salary of \$10,000. I believe that the salary is sufficient and adequate, and I shall vote against any increase of this kind.

Mr. WEBBER. Mr. Speaker, this is a question of living, purely a question of expense in household economy. That being true, let us not forget there are thousands of Government employees in this city who are compelled to live here three hundred and sixty-five days in a year who get hungry, and whose clothes wear out just as rapidly, and who have as large families as have we, that are getting but \$1,000 or \$1,200 a year. I for one can not give my vote, and shall not for any of these measures, so long as we ask such employees to continue on these salaries—and those who defended the flag to live upon \$12 and \$14 per month in their distress. I am ready and willing to vote for appropriations to do what is right by the old soldier and by his widow, but I will not give my vote nor my voice to increase the salary of any officials of the Government, from President down, so long as they receive the present compensation paid them by existing law.

We should not forget that we alone have the power to fix all these salaries, but we should not take advantage of the power thus lodged in us by the Constitution. Any Congressman who is willing to live in keeping with this spirit of the American people can live easily on \$5,000 when he is only compelled to stay in this city for six months.

Here are less than 400 of us who are affected in this body by this proposed legislation, while there are thousands working for the Government for ten and twelve hundred dollars per year. There are tens of thousands of defenders of the flag who only get \$12 or \$14 per month out of the same Treasury from which we are seeking to add to our \$5,000 a year. I shall cast my vote against the proposed amendment.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I suggested to the House of Representatives that it would be wise to turn over the legislation of the balance of this Congress to the men

who are going out of Congress, so that the standpoint from which legislation might come should be patriotic, intelligent, and disinterested.

Now, you have come right up against the proposition, and here we are. Here is a question involving a large sum of money and a great deal of principle submitted to a House of Representatives in which three-quarters of them are directly interested in the result of this vote.

Why are we proposing to increase the salary of any Member of Congress at any time? What are we doing it for; upon what ground or justification is it proposed to increase the salary from \$5,000 to \$7,500 at any time? I will answer my own question. It seems to me it is put on the ground that in the present condition of things in this country a salary of \$5,000 a year is wholly inadequate and that it ought to be raised. Why? What is the justification and explanation? Why, in the first place, the salary fixed a great many years ago is not worth as much, judged by the standard of the necessary expenditure of a Congressman, by 50 per cent as it was at the time it was enacted. Everything has advanced excepting the salaries of Congressmen and others who are dependent upon their salaries.

Take the railroads of the country. They have increased, during the last four or five years, the pay of their employees on an average about 40 per cent. It amounts to an enormous sum of money, and every class of labor and employment has been increased. But our Democratic friends tell us that the cost of living has increased in the same ratio. That is not, perhaps, quite true, but certainly the cost of living has increased very largely, and so all the wages are being increased somewhat in proportion to the increase in the cost of living. But the salaried man finds himself getting the worst of it. The man with a salary, the man with a fixed income, is the man who is injured by the advance in the cost of living and is not benefited in any way, except in the most indirect way, by the improvement in the condition of affairs.

Now, then, I take it that I am right about the proposition that the increase of salary to the Members of Congress is justified by the condition of the country. When is that condition to operate? Is there any possible logic or force in the proposition that because we find the present allowance to a Congressman considerably below what it ought to be, we will raise the salary of the Members of the Sixty-first Congress, but compel the Members of the Sixtieth Congress to serve at a price which is inadequate?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER], if I understood the logic of his argument, holds this: If the people of the country had had an opportunity at the last election they would have elected \$7,500 men. [Laughter.] But inasmuch as they did not have that opportunity and did elect \$5,000 men, therefore it would be unjust to raise the salary of \$5,000 men up to what they really ought to be paid.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do not think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] puts that quite squarely. I meant to be understood if we voted this amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] we would vote \$2,500 into our pockets that the people did not understand we were to have when we were elected, but if at the close of the next Congress they wanted to indorse the proposition they could elect \$7,500 men, and if we were fortunate enough to be selected we would accept the election.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let us see where the logic of the gentleman leads to. The people that elected my friend to Congress elected him to Congress charged with a knowledge of the Constitution. I will admit that it was a rather violent presumption [laughter], but they are charged with it in law and in logic. The Constitution permits the House of Representatives, cooperating with the Senate and the President, to fix the allowance of the Congressmen. Therefore the people of the gentleman's district are just as much bound by the action of Congress in raising his salary as they are to the proposition of adhering to the salary he now gets when they voted for him as a Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. So now we put it upon the ground that in view of all the circumstances the pay of a Congressman is inadequate. When? Now. It will be inadequate during the next two years if now, but who can say—and how utterly illogical it is to say—that during the next two years or three years or four years the same condition will apply that applies to-day? So, then, it is an assault upon the intelligence of the people of the

Congressional district represented by my friend from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] that they are willing to hold their Representative to an unconscionable bargain. He may have made that contract in effect, but here are fifty or sixty or seventy-five new Members coming into this House who have never had any opportunity to vote on the question of their salaries; and the logic of the gentleman is that the people of his district are willing to hold, notwithstanding the provisions of the Constitution, the Members of the House of Representatives to a hard bargain simply because they have agreed, under this forced construction of events, to serve for \$5,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have no interest in this. I have no interest in the salary of a Member of the Congress for the Sixtieth Congress, or for the Sixty-first Congress, nor for any other Congress, and I shall not find myself in the attitude of a pauper or a mendicant when I go out of Congress.

But, looking over the field, I take a widely different view from that held by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL]. I believe that a Member of Congress ought to be paid, and he ought to be paid a compensation adequate to secure just such services as the people in Congress are willing to give. They are competent men. I do not care whether they can earn more at home or whether they can not. Some can and some can not. The people of a district have a right to select the man they want. Sometimes they make mistakes [laughter], but not very often, just occasionally. In any event, I believe that the mass of the people of this country are fully willing that Congressmen should be adequately paid. The terrorizing effect of the salary grab is constantly held up to the faces of Congressmen. There never was any criticism of the increase of the salary of a Congressman. It was the retroactive effect of the statute upon the salary that had already been earned and paid, and the people of the country said that was unfair and an unjust proposition, and they punished the men, or some of the men, who did it. But no man ever heard of the people of any district, so far as I ever knew anything about it, punishing any man because he voted simply and solely for the increase of salary. If I were to be a Member of the Sixtieth Congress I would vote for this increase. If I were to be a Member of the Sixty-first Congress I would do it, and I would do it exactly upon the ground that old John A. Bingham said he did it when he voted both for the increase in the salary and the salary grab. He said he voted for it because he wanted the money, and he believed he had honestly earned it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to stop discussion of this subject, if the House will permit I will withdraw the amendment which I submitted; and I ask unanimous consent to have that done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAWNEY). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment striking out "1909" and inserting "1907." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE].

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, I have gladly voted for the increase in the salaries of the Speaker of this House and of the Vice-President and of the members of the President's Cabinet. I believe those increases are right and justifiable. There are Members of this House, chairmen of the great committees, whose salaries I would gladly vote to increase if I had the opportunity; but I do not believe that we are justified in raising the salaries of all of the Members of this House, as is proposed by this amendment. It is unfair to take the present high level of prices and consequent heavy expenses of living as a standard from which to gauge our salaries. We have been in an era of rising prices for the last ten years, until now we have reached apparently the very highest point, and all conservative thinkers believe we will soon begin an era of falling prices. Present conditions are extraordinary and should not control us at this high point of American industrial life, with high prices, with high salaries.

If we take the average of conditions for the last thirty-five years, we will find it far below the present high level. We should remember that for more than twenty years prior to 1896 we were in an era of falling prices. We should also remember that when these salaries are once raised it will be practically impossible to lower them however prices may fall. We are only here about six months in the year, on the average. Our usual business is going on at home, as a rule. It has been argued here that present salaries are so low that only the rich and worthless politician will come to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a high salary will certainly not keep out the rich, but, on the contrary, it will the more attract them; and surely we can not keep out the worthless politician by making

it more profitable for him to come here. A high salary is a premium upon cunning rather than upon virtue. Let us say to the world, and proclaim it for all time, that this is a place for men of honor and not those of itching palms, for men who put above all price the distinction of serving in the greatest Congress of the greatest democracy on earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose. [Great applause.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I only desire to briefly reply to some statements which have been made to-day. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE], whom I so much admire, a man of much good, solid judgment, has stated we are at the high mark of salaries? Whose salary? Members of Congress? The salaries of Members of this Congress were fixed in 1874. Since then the burdens of Members have increased tenfold, taking all of my time to meet them, and are constantly increasing, while the cost of living here has increased in about the same proportions since 1866 or 1874.

The salary fixed in 1874 was the same as in 1866, over forty years ago, when it was fixed at \$5,000, the amount we now receive. If that sum was just and proper in 1866 or 1874, it is not so to-day, and you all know it and admit it in private conversation. Why does the membership of Congress change so often? It is simply because the Members have been unable at any time, for any long period, to remain in Washington and meet the responsibilities of fathers and husbands and the inevitable expenses which fall on public men.

It is now suggested that we make this salary apply to the Sixty-first Congress, to be elected two years hence. I will vote for that. I have insisted on the Sixty-first Congress, because it must yet be elected, but I will vote for the Sixtieth Congress rather than these salaries shall not be raised at all.

The First Congress fixed its Members' salary, and President Washington approved it; the Fourth Congress did it, and President Madison approved it; the Fourteenth Congress did it, and President Madison, "the father of the Constitution," approved it—the same Madison who helped to frame the Constitution that my friend from Texas so gallantly protects and defends, and, thank God, he does it well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Give me a minute or two more.

Mr. LITTAUER. How much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will take two minutes. [Cries of "Give him five minutes!"]

Mr. LITTAUER. I yield the gentleman from Tennessee five minutes additional.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The Fifteenth Congress did it, and President Monroe approved it; the Thirty-fourth Congress did it, and President Pierce approved it; the Thirty-fifth Congress did it, and President Buchanan approved it; the Thirty-ninth Congress did it, and President Johnson approved it, at \$5,000 per year, forty years ago.

Repeatedly have I insisted that these salaries were not commensurate with the exigencies of Congressional life, however modest or unpretentious the Members may live, whether they are statesmen from Texas or Alabama or whether a plain, plodding, working Member of Congress from the great district of Nashville, Tenn. [Applause.] I know that my services are worth more. [Applause.] Day in and day out have I toiled at my official work that never ends, wholly unable to do any work for myself, though often tendered me and of a kind that would pay me well, but the public gets all my time, and should as long as I hold a membership of this body.

I am willing to go before my great constituency and let the people pass upon this question when they elect the Members of this House to the Sixty-first Congress two years hence.

I stated here and elsewhere before I was elected last November that I intended to do what I now am honorably trying to do. Some say we are voting money into our pockets. I deny this; but what did George Washington, the father of our country, say before he approved two acts of Congress fixing his salary at \$25,000? In his inaugural address he practically said he did not want any compensation as President. Go and read the RECORD of to-day and you will see his words on the subject. Am I any better than the father of my country?

There has not been a single Congress that I can recall that ever refixed a Congressional salary that did not fix it for the Members of the Congress then acting. Before 1791 they tried to make an amendment to the Constitution to prevent the "varying of compensation of Senators and Representatives until an intervening election of Representatives," but it was voted down.

When was it voted down? In the days of Washington, Madison, Jefferson, and Monroe, statesmen equally as great as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who voted to raise judicial salaries because, as he said, he wanted to get good men and give them something to pay for the clothes they wore and the house they rented, although theirs is a place full of honor and glory. [Applause.] I can well work for two years more for the same salary that I am working for now. It is not riches I seek, but justice to the public and the Members. It is not for my pocket, however lean it is; it is for the welfare of my country that I stand and speak for first [applause]; and when I can not cast my vote in this House for my country's welfare, as I see it, I will quit it and go back home to my people, who would not have me do otherwise. [Applause.] This back-salary grab of 1873 was an outrage. After Members of Congress had been paid their salary, or about all of it, for two years, they reached back two years and paid their salaries again.

They were turned, and properly so, out of Congress at the next election. But this proposition is for the future—a future Congress to be elected two years hence. It is the future and not the past for which I speak and shall vote. My successor in the Sixty-first Congress will get the benefit of any increased salary by this law, regardless of who he is. It is for the magnificent constituency of Tennessee which I represent in part, and for the people of all this country, who think and read and know that Senators and Representatives are entitled to better salaries. Believing that I am right, I shall vote for this measure, and if not right it can be easily repealed, but I feel the people of Andrew Jackson's district, the people of John Bell's district, the people of James K. Polk's district will approve my action, and if not I shall bow to the majesty of their will. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the previous question.

The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the resolution again.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LITTAUER) there were—ayes 135, noes 161.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 190, answered "present" 7, not voting 79, as follows:

YEAS—106.

Alken	Dale	Hepburn	Olcott
Allen, N. J.	Dalzell	Hogg	Overstreet, Ind.
Ames	Davey, La.	Huff	Patterson, Tenn.
Babcock	Davis, W. Va.	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne
Bannon	Denby	Jones, Wash.	Pearre
Barchfeld	Dixon, Mont.	Kennedy, Ohio	Prince
Bartholdt	Dovener	Knowland	Pujo
Bede	Dunwell	Lamb	Ransdell, La.
Beidler	Dwight	Landis, Frederick	Reyburn
Bennet, N. Y.	Ellis	Law	Riordan
Bingham	Fassett	Legare	Roberts
Bonyng	Fitzgerald	Littauer	Ryan
Brooks, Colo.	Fletcher	Longworth	Sherley
Broussard	Fordney	Loud	Sherman
Brown	Foster, Ind.	Loudenslager	Siemp
Brumm	Fulkerson	Lovering	Smith, Cal.
Buckman	Gaines, Tenn.	McCall	Smith, Ill.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines, W. Va.	McCreary, Pa.	Southard
Burleson	Gillett	McGavin	Sullivan
Burton, Del.	Goldfogle	McKinlay, Cal.	Tawney
Butler, Pa.	Goulden	McLachlan	Waldo
Calder	Graham	Mann	Wanger
Calderhead	Granger	Martin	Weeks
Clark, Fla.	Greene	Mondell	Wharton
Cocks	Grosvenor	Moore, Tex.	Wiley, N. J.
Coudrey	Hardwick	Mudd	
Cushman	Haskins	Needham	

NAYS—190.

Acheson	Broocks, Tex.	Conner	Driscoll
Adamson	Brownlow	Cooper, Pa.	Edwards
Alexander	Brundidge	Cooper, Wis.	Ellerbe
Allen, Me.	Burgess	Cousins	Esch
Andrus	Burleigh	Cromer	Field
Bartlett	Burnett	Crumpacker	Flood
Bates	Butler, Tenn.	Curtis	Floyd
Beall, Tex.	Campbell, Kans.	Darragh	Gardner, Mich.
Bell, Ga.	Campbell, Ohio	Davis, Minn.	Gardner, N. J.
Bennett, Ky.	Candler	Dawes	Garner
Birdsall	Capron	Dawson	Garrett
Boutell	Chaney	De Armond	Gilhams
Bowersock	Chapman	Deemer	Gill
Bradley	Clark, Mo.	Dickson, Ill.	Gillespie
Brantley	Clayton	Dixon, Ind.	Glass
Brick	Cole	Draper	Graft

Gronna	Klepper	Page	Spight
Gudger	Kline	Parker	Stafford
Hamilton	Knapp	Patterson, N. C.	Stanley
Haugen	Knopf	Patterson, S. C.	Steenerson
Hay	Lacey	Pollard	Stephens, Tex.
Hayes	Lafean	Powers	Sterling
Hedgie	Lamar	Rainey	Stevens, Minn.
Heflin	Landis, Chas. B.	Randell, Tex.	Sullivan
Henry, Conn.	Lawrence	Reeder	Talbott
Henry, Tex.	Lee	Rhodes	Taylor, Ohio
Hermann	Le Fevre	Richardson, Ala.	Thomas, N. C.
Higgins	Lever	Rives	Tirrell
Hill, Conn.	Lewis	Robinson, Ark.	Townsend
Hill, Miss.	Lilley, Conn.	Rucker	Trimble
Hinshaw	Little	Russell	Underwood
Holliday	Littlefield	Samuel	Volstead
Houston	Lloyd	Saunders	Vreeland
Howard	Lowden	Scroggy	Wallace
Howell, N. J.	McCleary, Minn.	Shackelford	Watkins
Howell, Utah	McKinney	Sheppard	Watson
Hughes	McLain	Sims	Webb
Hull	Macon	Slayden	Webber
Hunt	Madden	Smith, Iowa	Weems
James	Miller	Smith, Ky.	Weisse
Jenkins	Moon, Tenn.	Smith, Md.	Williams
Johnson	Mouser	Smith, Samuel W.	Willson
Jones, Va.	Murdock	Smith, Pa.	Wood
Keifer	Nelson	Smith, Tex.	Woodyard
Kennedy, Nebr.	Norris	Smyser	Young
Kinkaid	Otjen	Southall	Zenor
Kitchin, Claude	Overstreet, Ga.	Sparkman	
Kitchin, Wm. W.	Padgett	Sperry	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bishop	Foster, Vt.	Humphreys, Miss. Livingston
Currier	Hale	Lilley, Pa.

NOT VOTING—79.

Bankhead	Gilbert	Michalek	Schneebell
Blackburn	Goebel	Minor	Scott
Bowers	Gregg	Moon, Pa.	Shartel
Bowie	Griggs	Moore, Pa.	Sibley
Burke, Pa.	Hearst	Morrell	Small
Burton, Ohio	Hopkins	Murphy	Smith, Wm. Alden
Byrd	Hubbard	Nevin	Snapp
Cassel	Kahn	Olmsted	Southwick
Cockran	Kelher	Palmer	Sulzer
Davidson	Lindsay	Parsons	Taylor, Ala.
Dresser	Lorimer	Perkins	Thomas, Ohio
Englebright	McCarthy	Pou	Towne
Finley	McDermott	Reid	Tyndall
Flack	McKinley, Ill.	Reynolds	Van Duzer
Foss	McMorrin	Rhinock	Van Winkle
Fowler	McNary	Richardson, Ky.	Wachter
French	Mahon	Rixey	Wadsworth
Fuller	Marshall	Robertson, La.	Welborn
Garber	Maynard	Rodenberg	Wiley, Ala.
Gardner, Mass.	Meyer	Ruppert	

So the amendment was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. FULLER with Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. FRENCH with Mr. REID.

For the session:

Mr. VAN WINKLE with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.

On increase of Members' salaries:

Mr. REYNOLDS (against) with Mr. LINDSAY (in favor of).

Mr. LORIMER (in favor of) with Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi (against).

For this day:

Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. CASSEL with Mr. BOWIE.

Mr. DRESSER with Mr. HEARST.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. GREGG.

Mr. HUBBARD with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. HOPKINS.

Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. GARBER.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. RIXEY.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. ROBERTSON.

Mr. PARSONS with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. TOWNE.

Mr. TYNDALL with Mr. VAN DUZER.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. SHARTEL with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. McNARY.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. KELIHER.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER.

Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. MARSHALL with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts with Mr. RUPPERT.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to substitute the proper amounts

in the bill required by the adoption of the amendments increasing the compensation of the Vice-President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and also the members of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would also ask unanimous consent that gentlemen who have spoken be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the bill pending, and also in connection with them to insert an interview that I had three years ago touching the same subject.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have the gentleman make the request for anybody to extend remarks in the Record.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would extend the request that Members may be permitted to extend remarks in the Record on this question for three legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

Mr. MANN. What was the request?

The SPEAKER. The request is that in extending his remarks upon the bill pending he may insert with his remarks an interview that he had three years ago touching the same subject.

Mr. MANN. That comes under the general leave, and does not require unanimous consent.

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move the previous question on the bill to its passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BINGHAM, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE AT FORT SNELLING, MINN.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 196) relating to the construction of a bridge at Fort Snelling, Minn.

Resolved, etc., That all sums of money contributed and paid, or which may hereafter be contributed and paid, to the United States by the city of St. Paul, Minn., or by any electric street railway company, under the provision of an act of Congress approved March 17, 1906, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge between Fort Snelling Reservation and St. Paul, Minn.," shall be subject to the order of the Secretary of War, and shall be expended in such manner as he may direct on account of any expenses incurred, or which may be hereafter incurred, by the United States, in or about the construction of the bridge, as provided by said act; and that the time for commencing actual construction thereof is hereby extended one year from the date of the passage of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear a little explanation of this before action is had; and I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this is a joint resolution to supplement the act of March 17, 1906. In that act the Secretary of War was directed to construct a bridge between Fort Snelling Military Reservation and the city of St. Paul, Minn., one-half of the expense to be paid by the Government and one-half by the city of St. Paul by the street-railway company using the bridge. The Secretary of War reports to the Comptroller that the city of St. Paul and the street-railroad company have paid over the money for such part as they were required to pay. Now, Mr. Speaker, under the original act that money is held in trust and can not be used for the purpose of paying for the construction of the bridge; that it awaits the action of Congress. So this resolution directs as follows:

That this amount shall be subject to the order of the Secretary of War and shall be expended in such manner as he may direct on account of any expenses incurred, or which may be hereafter incurred, by the United States in or about the construction of the bridge.

That is all that it does.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MONONGAHELA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 20988) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize Washington and Westmoreland counties, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania," approved February 21, 1903.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of an act entitled "An act to authorize Washington and Westmoreland counties, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania," approved February 21, 1903, as amended by the act approved January 11, 1905, and by the act approved February 21, 1906, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows: "Sec. 7. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from February 21, 1907."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman if this follows the requirements of the War Department?

Mr. WANGER. The only purpose of this bill is to extend the time within which the bridge may be begun and completed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It complies with the requirements of the War Department, so that it does not interfere with navigation?

Mr. WANGER. Yes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WANGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. LITTLE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. JEFFERSON DAVIS,
Governor of Arkansas, and

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives:

You and each of you will take notice that I hereby tender my resignation as a Member of the Fifty-ninth Congress from the Fourth district of Arkansas, my resignation to take effect on and after the 14th day of January, 1907.

Very respectfully,

JOHN S. LITTLE.

The communication was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH SETTLERS MAY ESTABLISH THEIR RESIDENCE UPON THE CROW INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 21678) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Crow Indian Reservation, within the counties of Yellowstone and Rosebud, in the State of Montana.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the homestead settlers on lands which were heretofore a part of the Crow Indian Reservation, within the counties of Yellowstone and Rosebud, in the State of Montana, opened under the act of April 27, 1904, be, and they are hereby, granted an extension of time in which to establish their residence upon the lands so opened and filed upon until the 15th day of May, 1907: *Provided, however,* That this act shall in no manner affect the regularity or validity of such filings, or any of them, so made by the said settlers on the lands aforesaid; and it is only intended hereby to extend the time for the establishment of such residence as herein provided, and the provisions of said acts are in no other manner to be affected or modified.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the extension of time within which homestead entrymen may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Crow Indian Reservation, within the counties of Yellowstone and Rosebud, in the State of Montana."

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Amend the title of the bill by striking out the word "settlers" in line 2 of the title and inserting in lieu thereof the word "entrymen."

Amend by striking out the word "settlers" in line 3 of the bill and inserting in lieu thereof the word "entrymen."

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if this comes from the Indian Committee?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. The Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if this applies to anybody not living on the lands?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Under the terms of the bill opening the land to settlement and sale, the entries were made last August. Under the general act, they are to establish their residence within six months. The land is all land upon which they have got to dig irrigation ditches. Many can not go on this winter on account of the snow on the ground and build, because they had not the time and money; and this bill merely gives them until May 15 in which to build houses, and does not change the original bill at all except in that particular.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman have any objection to making the date June 15?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I would be perfectly willing to have it June 15, although May 15 the grass comes on and the snow has gone.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have had communications from different parts of the country relative to this matter saying that they could not go there and make the necessary improvements because of the late spring and severe weather.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I would be glad to accept an amendment of June 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the same question will be presented in the Shoshone Reservation in Wyoming. The 15th of May was the date fixed there. That seems to be, in both cases, ample time to allow them all to get in. If one of these bills changed, perhaps the other ought to be changed.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I think the 15th of May will give them ample time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GRIGGS, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. RHODES, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Sarah Brewer, widow and sole heir of estate of John Brewer, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Michael Rubi against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a recommendation for legislation to provide that the reservation of coal and asphalt lands shall not interfere with town-site locations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Assistant Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. B. Roberson, administrator of estate of John P. Roberson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of receipts and expenditures on account of appropriations for contingent expenses of the War Department, 1905 and 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting papers in the claim of Felipe Zamora, of Manila, P. I.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting papers in the claim of Severino R. Alberto for rent of a house in Binangonan, Rizal, P. I.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for a sea wall at Fort Moultrie—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of the general hospital at the Presidio, San Francisco—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for pay of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Signal Service of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Signal Service of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for transportation of troops in connection with the Jamestown Ter-Centenary Exposition—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21200) to authorize the county of Allegheny, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River in Allegheny County, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5464); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 121) authorizing the extension of Seventeenth street NW., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5465); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 128) for the opening of a connecting highway between Water Side drive and Park road, District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5466); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5971) authorizing the extension of T street (formerly W street) NW., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5467); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7039) authorizing the extension of Prospect street NW., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5468); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8435) for the opening of Fessenden street NW., District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5469); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10843) authorizing the extension of Kenyon street NW., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5470); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10703) authorizing the extension of Monroe street NE., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5471); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14815) for the extension of Harvard street, Columbia Heights, District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5472); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14900) to extend Fourth, Sixth, and other streets NE., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5473); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20069) for the opening of Macomb street NW., District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5474); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 55) for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, ac-

companied by a report (No. 5475); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 64) for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5476); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 133) authorizing the extension of Twenty-third street NW. to Kalorama road, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5477) which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2098) authorizing the extension of Second street NW. from Elm street north to Bryant street, of W street from its present terminus west of Flagler place to Second street, and of W street west of Second street eastwardly to Second street, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5478); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2260) authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5479); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5119) authorizing the extension of W and Adams streets NW., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5480); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5246) to provide for the extension of Genesee place and Summit place, District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5481); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5565) to close certain alleys in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5482); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 129) for the opening of a connecting parkway along Piney Branch, between Sixteenth street and Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5483); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 68) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5484); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6364) to incorporate the National Child Labor Committee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5485); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 22471) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Ocala, Fla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 22472) increasing the salaries of the civil-service employees of the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 22473) to authorize the erection of a public building at Brainerd, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 22474) to amend section 51 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to disability of judge—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 22475) to establish a subtreasury at Birmingham, Ala.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 22476) to amend the acts to regulate commerce so as to provide that publishers of newspapers and periodicals may enter into advertising contracts with common carriers and receive payment for such advertisements in transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 22477) for the establishment of a drainage fund and the construction of works for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22478) for the completion of section No. 1 of the Trinity River, and for the operation of snag boats and care of locks and dams, and for the construction of locks and dams below section 1—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 22479) to provide for a tax upon legacies and distributive shares of real and personal property—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 22480) to survey Bayou Terrebonne in Terrebonne Parish, La., and to appropriate therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22481) authorizing a survey of Bayou Vermillion, Louisiana, and making appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 22482) to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to investigate the cause of pulmonary consumption in humans, and to seek remedies for the prevention and cure of the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 22483) to regulate the width of parking, sidewalks, roadways, and carriage ways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 22484) authorizing a change in the form of paying pensioners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 22485) fixing the salaries of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A resolution (H. Res. 664) for the employment of additional help (temporary) in the file room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A resolution (H. Res. 665) for the employment of a messenger in the disbursing clerk's office—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A resolution (H. Res. 666) providing for an annual assistant clerk for the Committee on Pensions—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 22486) granting an increase of pension to Joseph V. Lacy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22487) granting an increase of pension to Helen Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 22488) for the relief of Dennis Adkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22489) granting an increase of pension to John Travis, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22490) granting an increase of pension to James W. Swim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22491) granting an increase of pension to William M. Lowder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 22492) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 22493) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22494) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose D. Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22495) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22496) granting an increase of pension to William C. Carnagy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 22497) granting an honorable discharge to Francis A. Land—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 22498) granting an increase of pension to William E. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22499) granting a pension to Mary A. O'Reilly—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 22500) granting an increase of pension to Minor C. Cleavenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22501) granting an increase of pension to Austin B. Truman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22502) granting an increase of pension to Orren D. Haskell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 22503) granting an increase of pension to William A. Clarke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22504) granting an increase of pension to James M. Low—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 22505) to correct the military record of Thomas Moffett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 22506) granting an increase of pension to James F. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22507) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 22508) granting a pension to Anna McDonald—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22509) granting a pension to Frank Ferriss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22510) granting a pension to William E. Puett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22511) granting an increase of pension to L. T. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22512) granting an increase of pension to Levi Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22513) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22514) granting an increase of pension to Thomas V. Coddington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22515) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. W. H. Coppinger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22516) granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22517) granting an increase of pension to John M. G. Mayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22518) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Bartlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 22519) granting a pension to Sarah R. Dunlop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 22520) granting an increase of pension to Nicodemus D. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22521) for relief of James R. Wyrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 22522) granting an increase of pension to Susan Harraun—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22523) granting an increase of pension to James A. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22524) granting an increase of pension to David Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 22525) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22526) granting an increase of pension to Eli B. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22527) granting an increase of pension to Duncan Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 22528) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 22529) granting an increase of pension to William Truett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 22530) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Humes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22531) granting an increase of pension to Allen McCall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22532) granting an increase of pension to Frederick B. Welty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22533) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Peer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22534) granting an increase of pension to Perry B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22535) granting an increase of pension to Samuel White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22536) granting an increase of pension to William J. Carns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22537) granting an increase of pension to William M. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22538) granting an increase of pension to William Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22539) granting an increase of pension to John Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 22540) granting an increase of pension to Richard Turnbull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 22541) granting an increase of pension to David Fyl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 22542) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte S. O'Neill—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 22543) granting to the town of Pawnee, in Pawnee County, Okla., certain lands for park, educational, and other public purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 22544) for the relief of E. J. Seeds—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 22545) granting a pension to Charles H. Jesse—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 22546) granting an increase of pension to James H. Sewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 22547) granting an increase of pension to John Hickox, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22548) granting an increase of pension to Franklin H. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 22549) granting a pension to S. E. Furnas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYBURN: A bill (H. R. 22550) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan B. Reber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22551) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Siddell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22552) granting restoration of pension to Eli W. Elzey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 22553) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Behymer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22554) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Rust—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22555) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Bickers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 22556) for the relief of Samuel A. Reppy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22557) granting a pension to David H. Gregg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22558) granting a pension to Jane Kearns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22559) granting a pension to Christopher P. Hornsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22560) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22561) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin M. Lanham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 22562) granting an increase of pension to George J. Abbey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22563) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Whytal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22564) granting an increase of pension to D. R. Lamoreau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22565) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Starnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22566) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Six—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22567) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Van Valkenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22568) granting an increase of pension to John H. Christman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 22569) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Swearingen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 22570) granting a pension to Andrew W. Sears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 22571) for the relief of Caroline Elliott, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22572) for the

relief of the estate of Lee Arnold, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 22573) granting an increase of pension to William R. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22574) granting an increase of pension to James Baxter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22575) granting an increase of pension to Allen M. Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 22576) for the relief of Capt. Thomas Mason, United States Revenue-Cutter Service (retired)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 22577) granting an increase of pension to James R. Fairbrother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22578) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22579) granting a pension to Mary J. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 22148) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Pruett—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22149) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Price—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22150) granting an increase of pension to Ma-linda P. Sullivan—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22197) granting an increase of pension to James W. Chambers—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22241) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Robinson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22306) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Duncan—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22310) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Kerr—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 19632) granting a pension to Louise H. Curtis—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16906) granting an increase of pension to Charles Malm—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21352) granting a pension to Hester B. Parrish—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of citizens of Illinois, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AIKEN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Ma-linda P. Sullivan, Louise E. Price, and Martha Ann Pruett (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Summerhill Grange, No. 880, for legislation for an experimental parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Petitions of Foster Council, No. 121; Davy Crockett Council, No. 98; Trinity Council, No. 50; Friendship Council, No. 83, and Wallingford Council, No. 107, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of John Nichols, Andrew J. Moon, Joseph Belford, James W. Swim, John Travis, jr., and William M. Lowde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of Council No. 73, of Claiborne, Tenn., Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: Petition of the Laurel Board of Trade for an appropriation to improve Broad Creek River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. Russell Hayes, of Swarthmore College, against legislation respecting the importation of books in the English language—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of New London Council, No. 983, of New London, Pa.; Coatesville Council, No. 170, of Coatesville, Pa.; Rockdale Council, No. 803, of Glen Riddle, Pa., and Sharon Hill Council, No. 55, Daughters of Liberty, of Sharon Hill, Pa., respecting the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petitions of Victory Council, No. 7, Daughters of America; Carricks Ford Council, No. 14; Tyrconnell Council, No. 111; Martinsburg Council, No. 35; Hedgesville Council, No. 126, and Back Creek Valley Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of Red, White, and Blue Council, No. 78, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the New York Produce Exchange, against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of colored citizens of Boston, against the President's order discharging three companies of the Twenty-fifth Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Post No. 443, Grand Army of the Republic, of Kings County, N. Y., for restoration of the canteen to Soldiers' Homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Ewing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Horatio M. McGaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Arkansas, for legislation to make the waters of White River available for electrical motive power—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Lay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of P. H. Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James M. Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Manly—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: Petition of John M. Bouldin, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of Pride Valley Council, No. 284, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of Scout Young Camp, Spanish War Veterans of Oregon, for restoration of the canteen at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Frederick B. Welty, Allen McCall, Robert D. Humes, Daniel M. Peer, Perry B. Wilson, Samuel White, William J. Carns, William M. Jordan, William Beck, and John Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of A. E. Yoell, the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League, E. R. Coulson, A. E. Smith, John Ferem, P. H. McCarthy, et al., against Chinese, Japanese, and Korean labor on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for additional submarine boats for the defense of the Pacific coast—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for an appropriation to widen and deepen Oakland channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., for an appropriation to widen and deepen Oakland channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: Petition of the Charles G. Harrison Printing Company, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of Violet Council, No. 14, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. L. E. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 22054, granting a pension to Paul E. Ayer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for an appropriation for a harbor of refuge at Point Judith—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the New York Produce Exchange, against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., for an appropriation to improve the banks of the Mississippi River from Quincy to Warsaw—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of Saw Filers and Setters' Union, for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Perry Lamphere and Charles C. Gage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Queen City Council, No. 49, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Mountain City Council, No. 12, and Star of America Council, No. 2, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REYBURN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Wilson Liddell and Eli W. Elzey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Petition of the national committee on legislation of the Spanish War Veterans, of Kentucky, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin M. Lanham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of colored citizens of Boston, against the discharge of three companies of the Twenty-fifth Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the State board of agriculture, for liberal appropriations to suppress the gypsy and brown-tail moths—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN: Petitions of C. H. Bierbaum, the Sumen-Bearing Company, the E. R. Thomas Motor Company, Plimpton, Cowan & Co., the Cling Surface Company, and the Pratt & Letchworth Company, Buffalo, N. Y., for increased efficiency of the Patent Office—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Oscar Madden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Caroline Elliott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry R. Darst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of Eli Davis et al., favoring bill H. R. 14609, for special pensions for ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Niagara Council, No. 8, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Newtown Council, No. 730, of Newtown, Bucks County, Pa., and Bethayres Council, No. 987, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, December 15, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 22580) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908; which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York reserves all points of order.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LITTAUER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 22584) making appropriations to supply